

The University of Maine

DigitalCommons@UMaine

---

General University of Maine Publications

University of Maine Publications

---

4-9-2021

## Motions put before the University of Maine Faculty Senate, January 2015-December 1999

University of Maine Faculty Senate

Kimberly Junkins  
*University of Maine*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/univ\\_publications](https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/univ_publications)



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

University of Maine Faculty Senate and Junkins, Kimberly, "Motions put before the University of Maine Faculty Senate, January 2015-December 1999" (2021). *General University of Maine Publications*. 1210.  
[https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/univ\\_publications/1210](https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/univ_publications/1210)

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in General University of Maine Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact [um.library.technical.services@maine.edu](mailto:um.library.technical.services@maine.edu).

- [Spring '21 COVID-19 updates](#)
- [A-Z](#)
- [Calendar](#)
- [Give](#)
- [Map](#)
- [News](#)
- [Careers](#)
- [myUMaine](#)



## Faculty Senate

[All Motions](#)

**2016 – 2017 Motions**

**2015 – 2016 Motions**

**2014 – 2015 Motions**

**October 15, 2014**

**Ad Hoc IT Committee**

**Motion to Create a New Section of the Faculty Handbook 2.4**

### **PREAMBLE**

The University of Maine, the flagship and System's public research institution, educates 40-50% of the students in the System. Highly specialized training is required of faculty for determining both pedagogy and research. However, as part of the reorganization of Information Technologies (IT) on a centralized model, System-level decisions have begun to impact faculty's ability to determine what educational technology and learning management systems are available, despite pedagogical needs. But decisions about pedagogy and curricular delivery methods are key to the faculty's mission at UM and are too highly specialized to be rendered by central IT administrative functions. Indeed, System IT should not have authority to determine what learning technologies should be incorporated into curriculum or courseware, just as System IT has never had authority to choose traditional curricular materials such as textbooks or course resources. Faculty should have primacy in the determination of the curriculum and the delivery of materials in the classroom and the learning processes associated with the academic experience both on and off-campus, including innovation and research in pedagogy appropriate to their disciplines and selection of learning tools and technologies. Redressing the overreach of the System at the earliest possible moment will both establish a proper precedent for respecting the distinct domains of authority at System and campus levels and protect academic freedoms currently enjoyed by faculty.

### **Motion**

**Motion to Create a New Section of the Faculty Handbook Devoted to** curriculum and the delivery of materials associated with the academic experience, to read as follows:

2.4 The faculty of the University of Maine have the authority and expertise to determine the curriculum and the delivery of materials in the classroom and the learning processes associated with the academic experience both on campus and in distance education. This primacy and responsibility of the faculty also include the responsibility to innovate and to stay current with research in pedagogy in their disciplines. The broad range of tools used in modern education is an important aspect of current pedagogy and must be appropriate to the material and the educational needs of the students. Educational tools for which the faculty have primary decision-making include, but are not limited to, text books, problems solving guides and software, tutorial materials and software and the interactive learning management systems. Decisions related to these educational tools can only be made by faculty who have specific expertise in the material and pedagogy of the field. The cost of these materials may be passed on to the students but should be covered by course related fees, research funds and other faculty guided money when possible to minimize any additional financial cost to the students while ensuring the highest quality educational experience.

**Vote: Approved**

## Program Creation & Reorganization Review

### Background:

The University of Maine has no residency requirement and encourages the creation of online programs when appropriate. Associate Provost Jeff St. John suggested an expedited PCRRC process for conversion of face-to-face programs and certificates to online/hybrid format *"where no significant curricular changes accompany that conversion."* The PCRRC committee met on Sept. 24, 2014 and approved an option for expedited review, providing that faculty input is sufficiently documented and that the quality of online instruction is not impaired. Applications will be posted on the PCRRC website and faculty will be notified for response. PCRRC will then have the option to expedite the process of approval or to recommend full Faculty Senate review.

### Motion:

*Motion: The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation that the PCRRC may expedite the review process for conversion from classroom to online/hybrid programs "where no significant curricular changes accompany that conversion," as proposed by the academic units.*

**Vote: Approved**

**November 12, 2014**

### Academic Affairs Committee of Faculty Senate offers the following motion on the 2015-2016 Academic Calendar

Whereas, the University of Maine has a mission to deliver a fully accredited, 14 weeks of instruction and 1 week of finals a semester to our students to insure the continuity of academic planning and program integrity, it is proposed that all features and dates of the attached Academic Calendar for 2015-2016 be adopted.

This motion proposes that the Spring semester, 2016 has the start date of January 11<sup>th</sup>; Spring Recess period beginning Monday, February 29<sup>th</sup> with class resumption on March 14<sup>th</sup>; and the end of the semester will occur after final exam week ends on May 6<sup>th</sup>. The reasons for these dates are determined by academic and research scholarship across the University of Maine campus and include:

- Efficient beginning of the semester to insure academic completion of all student requirements as early as possible to accommodate summer internships and coursework (e.g. May and June term), and student employment goals.
- Retention of the timing and duration of Spring Break to insure planning and coordination of student and faculty coordinated research and travel coursework, alternative spring break activities and student athletic spring competition.

**Vote: Approved**

**December 17, 2014**

PCRRC Motion Regarding Process.  
For Faculty Senate. December 17, 2014

**Background:** The Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee (PCRRC) of the Faculty Senate reviews all proposals for creation, elimination and reorganization of academic units. A major responsibility of the committee is to notify all faculty and solicit comments to evaluate the impact of proposed changes across campus, including the impact on course availability, departmental collaborations, university accreditation and funding sources. Faculty Senate anticipates unnecessary harm if the faculty, who most understand academic systems, do not fully participate in these processes.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate seeks assurance that standard procedures as detailed in the PCRRC Policy Manual will be adhered to during APRIP and all other proceedings, with the support of the University of Maine Administration and the University of Maine System. To this end the Faculty Senate requires that documents be submitted to the PCRRC at Stage 2 of the Fifteen Stage Process for program creation and reorganization, and at the initiation of the Program Elimination Procedure.

**Vote: Approved**

### Motion: University of Maine Faculty Senate Support of a University of Maine System General Education Transfer Block Process

The University of Maine Faculty Senate hereby:

- (a) supports the UMS General Education Transfer Block as set forth in Section I of this document;
- (b) specifies in Section II of this document those UMaine courses that a UMaine student transferring to another UMS campus must complete in order to meet the minimum requirements of the UMS General Education Transfer Block (i.e. the University of Maine General Education *Transfer-Out Block*);
- (c) specifies in Section III of this document additional University of Maine General Education Course Requirements that students transferring from another UMS campus must additionally fulfill beyond the courses officially certified by the originating campus as fulfilling the UMS General

Education Transfer Block;

(d) explicitly recognizes in Section IV of this document that incoming transferring students that have met the UMS General Education Transfer Block may be required to take additional General Education courses required by an academic degree major, and

(e) recognizes the authority of the faculty on all other UMS campuses to make similar curriculum matter determinations for their own campuses in a mutually supportive fashion in furthering the best interests of students on each and among the UMS campuses.

**Vote: Approved**

See background at [UMSGenEdTransferBlockAtUMaineVer9](#)

**Academic Affairs Committee (12/10/2014)**

prepared by Senators Thomas C. Sanford and Richard Borgman.

**Prior Learning Assessment Motion**

The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine accepts the "Revised Recommendations and Next Steps for Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) in the University of Maine System" (attached) subject to the following limitations/concerns:

The system schools must agree to a common cut-off score for a test to be accepted in transfer. Until there is a common cutoff score, AP, CLEP and DSST exams are "subject to approval" at the departmental level for them to be accepted as meeting program requirements. If not they will come in as free electives only.

15 credit limitation on credits earned as a result of CLEP/DSST exams.

15 credit limitation on Credential Review credits

15 credit limitation on Military credits

15 credit limitation on Academic Portfolio Assessments

Course credit earned at another system school as a result of prior learning evaluation must be identified in some manner so that UMaine can enforce our 15 credit limitation.

If PLA credit for a course that is transferred is unacceptable to accreditation criteria or ***state licensing***, then the PLA credit may be disallowed for that program ***or reassessment for credit***.

The processes and policies of academic portfolio assessment are consistent across all campuses and approved by all campuses before the PLA policy is implemented. Until that time Credit awarded at another system school will be subject to review at the University of Maine before acceptance.

Approved with edits (in bold italics).

**Vote: Approved**

Additional background [PLA final copy june 2013a copy](#).

**January 28, 2015**

**Academic Affairs Committee**

**January 28, 2015**

**Calendar Motion 2 for 2015-2016**

**Background:**

As the Faculty Senate determines the academic requirements of the University of Maine, we had passed a calendar motion on December 17, 2014 which named a 14 week semester for both Spring and Fall of 2015-2016 with the Spring semester start date to occur on January 11<sup>th</sup>, and final exam week with ends May 6<sup>th</sup>. This motion rewrites the start date of Spring Semester and adds one week. All other features, including Spring Break, shall remain as previously determined.

**Motion:**

- We hereby approve a change in the Academic Year Calendar for 2015-2016. The new calendar permits a new three-week Winter term, the standard two-week March Spring break, and preserves a 14-week semester plus exam week. The purpose of the Winter term is to promote retention of undergraduate students.
- As a consequence, we will commence Spring semester classes on the day after Martin Luther King Day which is 1/19/16 and will end the semester on 5/9/16. Commencement will occur on 5/14/16.

The impact of the new Winter term on May term enrollment is of interest for pedagogical reasons as May term will be pushed forward by one week from these changes. Hence, we request that the Provost's office inform Faculty Senate regarding enrollments in the new Winter Term to compare with the 2016 May Term enrollment.

**February 25, 2015**

**Sexual Harassment Policy at the University of Maine  
Academic Affairs Committee  
February 25, 2015**

**Motion 5:** The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine endorses the attached letter to President Hunter and Provost Hecker.

**Vote: Approved**

Academic Affairs Committee

**February 25, 2015**

**Motion 1:** The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine recommends President Hunter convene a **Presidential Task Force** with full participation of all stakeholders including faculty with specialized expertise in sexual harassment, assault and discrimination, representation of faculty senate, the director of Victim Advocacy, graduate and undergraduate students, public safety, community members (e.g., Spruce Run/Womencare and Rape Response Services), and representation of the administration. The charge of this task force will be to develop a comprehensive policy on sexual discrimination that balances the interests of the institution with a clear interest in victim advocacy and is clearly based upon the policy guidelines issued by the Office of Civil Rights, learned groups such as the American Association of University Professors, pertinent research, and best clinical practices that are widely accepted.

**Vote: Approved**

**Academic Affairs Committee  
February 25, 2015**

**Motion 2:** The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine recommends creating an **independent office of victim advocacy** and the immediate hiring of a **Director of Victim Advocacy** appropriately credentialed and trained who reports directly to the president. The Director will be charged two directives in mind:

1. The health and well-being of students.
2. The needs of the institution to report and act upon instances of sexual discrimination.

**Vote: Approved – Yea 15, Nay 5, Abstain 6**

**Academic Affairs Committee  
February 25, 2015**

**Motion 3:** The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine recommends the sexual discrimination policy that requires a statement in all class syllabi that defines faculty and teaching assistants as mandated reporters be rescinded.

We recommend a new policy be developed including a new statement to be included in all class syllabi that reaffirms our concerns about the issues of sexual and gender discrimination, and encourages faculty and teaching assistants to recommend students who share their concerns about instances of sexual or gender discrimination to a confidential Office of Victim Advocacy.

**Vote: Approved – (Yea 16, Nay 4, Abstain 2)**

**Academic Affairs Committee  
February 25, 2015**

**Motion 4:** The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine recommends **nearly all reports of sexual harassment and discrimination be addressed to the Director of Victim Advocacy and treated as confidential.** The Director may work with the complainant to consider available options that include disclosure to non-confidential sources. Exceptions to the confidentiality rule would be clearly stated as a matter of policy and include cases where harm is imminent. Such policy would be modeled after similar policies that guide the relationships of therapists and clients.

**Vote: Approved – Yea 14, Nay 5, Abstain 3**

**April 1, 2015**

Dr. Susan J. Hunter  
President  
University of Maine

**April 1, 2015**

**Research, Scholarship and Creative Achievement at the University of Maine: Defining UMaine's Mission**

Dear President Hunter,

On the occasion of the 150<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the University of Maine, we recognize the distinctive value of research, scholarship and creative achievement in the State's only comprehensive research university. With its Carnegie ranking of Research-High, and its status as a top-100 public American Research University on a number of key measures, the State can take great pride in the University's accomplishments and the competitive niche that it fills in the University of Maine System. As a Land Grant and Sea Grant institution, the University of Maine performs both basic and applied research that advances knowledge and fuels innovation. It fills critical research needs in the State of Maine through its Experiment Stations, Cooperative Extension outreach, and a broad mix of high-quality programs in the sciences, engineering, technology, arts and humanities. Through its quality faculty and cutting-edge research infrastructure, the University is constantly improving its ability to compete for federal grants and contracts and its capacity to serve business and industry. The University's efforts are strongly focused on Maine's priorities, conducting research in all of the State's targeted technology sectors, emphasizing technology transfer and commercialization as indicated by the rapid growth of its patent portfolio and spin-off companies. The creativity and ingenuity of the University community fuels Maine's Creative Economy, contributing to thriving communities, good jobs and a better quality of life for all. Graduate and undergraduate students play a central role in all of these efforts as they prepare to participate in building Maine's future prosperity. The University of Maine is the Flagship campus of the University of Maine System and one of the State's most valuable public assets; it must play a fundamental role in shaping Maine's future and providing quality opportunities for all Maine citizens. In celebration of the University's 150<sup>th</sup> Anniversary, we ask that the University of Maine adopt the following position statement. We also request that you send it to the Chancellor with the request that the University of Maine System adopt the statement and include it in the University of Maine System Policy Manual.

Sincerely Yours,

Members of the Faculty Senate Committee on Research and Scholarship

**POSITION STATEMENT ON RESEARCH**

As the State's Land Grant and Sea Grant institution, and the State's only comprehensive research university, the University of Maine is obligated to contribute research to the State, Nation, and World. To sustain this primary function, the University will actively encourage and support research, scholarship, and creative endeavors of its faculty, staff and students. The University of Maine is therefore committed to the following aims of research, scholarship, and creative achievement.

1. To fulfill the primary obligation of the University to create and advance new knowledge for the benefit of society.
2. To explore and develop new industries and creative enterprises, new applications of science, technology, engineering and mathematics, and new frontiers in all fields of knowledge.
3. To provide members of the faculty and students with the encouragement, resources and opportunities required to pursue inquiry and intellectual growth, and to foster an environment conducive to creating, growing and validating new ideas.
4. To recognize that quality instruction at both the graduate and undergraduate level depends to a great extent on research, and that this relationship between instruction and research is a distinctive characteristic of the University.
5. To train undergraduate and graduate students in the methods and ethics of research, and to recognize that research is inseparably linked to graduate study.
6. To contribute to the solution of problems by rendering effective service to the State, Nation and World.

**April 29, 2015**

***Only the motion will be listed below, all background will be in a link.***

**Motion: IT Support for Cloud-Based Secure Storage to Students, Faculty and Staff**

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate calls on the University of Maine and the University of Maine System to provide

- Updated security policies and guidance for file storage enabling students, faculty and staff to safely store necessary information on university provided network drives; and

- Cloud-based secure storage and retrieval (with backup) for all data and local files produced, especially those containing sensitive data, to ensure the safety and security of student and administrative information, and accessible at any time through a secure network connection.

To ensure the safety and security of information and provide timely support to students and staff, this program must be in place prior to the start of the 2015-16 academic year.

**Vote:** Approved

[IT Support for Cloud-1](#)

#### **Motion: IT Support for Departmental Administrative Staff**

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate calls on the University of Maine and the University of Maine System to

1. Determine and implement policies and procedures for managing computers supported by central IT staff, including mechanisms and schedules for update and replacement;
2. Provide as-needed training support for software used by administrative assistants and other departmental staff; and
3. Charge IT to first perform an inventory of hardware/software used by UM admin staff and then undertake an analysis of the data to establish the state of non-academic computing at UM, both its hardware and software.

To ensure timely support of administrative staff, and by extension students and faculty, this program must be implemented prior to the start of the 2015-16 academic year.


**Amendment:** In consultation with the Ad Hoc IT Advisory committee and appropriate committees of the Administration representative of the faculty and staff.

**Vote:** Approved

[IT Support for Departmental Administrative Staff 1](#)

#### **Motion: IT Support for the Academic Mission**

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate calls on the University of Maine and the University of Maine System to prioritize proper financial support of academic IT at UM by directing appropriate resources to meet the teaching mission of UM, including directing technology funds collected under the Unified Fee, to provide and tri-annually update:

- 1) Networked computers in classrooms for teaching;
- 2) Dedicated technology-enhanced classrooms supporting technology-intensive teaching;
- 3) A high-speed (FCC's current definition) wireless campus network system that provides  reliable access for students and faculty in any size classroom;
- 4) Updated and modern display technologies in large classrooms and rooms identified for technology-intensive teaching;
- 5) Hardware and site-licensed software sufficient to facilitate research, teaching and student learning; and
- 6) Short- and mid-term plans for technology migration into classrooms, to be developed and annually updated jointly by the Faculty Development Office and IT and presented to the Faculty Senate each spring semester, with progress reports to be presented to the Senate each fall semester.

To ensure timely support to students and faculty this program must be in place prior to the start of the 2015-2016 academic year.

**Vote:** Approved

[IT Support for the Academic Mission-](#)

#### **Motion(s): PCRRC regarding the new B.S. in Cybersecurity Program**

**Motion 1:** The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the PCRRC, in support of the University of Maine System (UMS) B. S. in Cybersecurity Program Proposal, while questioning the premise that this can necessarily be accomplished at no additional costs.

**Vote:** Approved

**Motion 2:** The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the PCRRC, in support of the University of Maine B.S. in Cybersecurity, as presented by the School of Computing & Information Sciences (CIS), if financial needs are met.

**Financial Consideration:** The B.S. in Cybersecurity will require additional faculty resources in order to teach computer science courses that are part of the Cybersecurity curriculum. A total of twelve COS courses are part of the required courses. While most of these courses are existing courses,

several are not offered on a regular basis. The School of Computing and Information Science does not have the faculty in order to offer these additional courses. The following resources are needed:

Academic Year 2016: Section money to offer COS 221 in Spring 2016.

Academic Year 2017: Section money to offer (1) COS 221 in Spring 2017 and (2) COS 336 in Fall 2016, and (3) for COS 140 in Fall 2016 in case it's enrollment exceeds 100 students.

Starting in Fall 2017, we will need a full-time faculty.

Mechanisms of intercampus cooperation and costs of long-term addition of course sections need to be considered. PCRRC supports the proposal contingent on resolving financial issues.

**Vote:** Approved

[Cybersecurity motion Revised April 27 B2](#)

[Cybersecurity motion Addendum Financial Consideration](#)

**Motion: Motion on Statement of Principle in Regard to Block Transfer of General Education Courses from campuses of the Maine Community College System**

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine supports in principle the concept of developing a

General Education Block agreement with the colleges of the Maine Community College System – an agreement to be modeled on the UMS General Education Transfer Block, which would in addition include an assessment framework to ensure that community college students who made use of the transfer block would have completed general education courses at the 100 and 200-level that meet the expectations of all participating institutions and provide a good foundation for student success throughout the state of Maine.

**Vote:** Approved

[GenEdBlockMotionWithCommunityColleges](#)

**Resolution: Resolution to Enhance University of Maine's leadership in furtherance of Greater Energy and Environmental Sustainability**

**THEREFORE**, BE IT RESOLVED that the University of Maine Faculty Senate calls upon the undergraduate student government, the graduate student government and the Faculty Senate at the University of Maine to each appoint an ad hoc committee to work with each other to develop a common motion that their representative bodies might all mutually and strongly support with the goal of placing the University of Maine in a national leadership position towards expanding investment in renewable energy sources by the campus and our State, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, exploring and developing means to eliminate or reduce the adverse consequences of renewable energy generation, and exploring and developing means to adapt to climate change.

**Vote:** Approved

[InSupportOfCampusSustainability](#)

**A majority vote was required to return the following motion, originally presented at the February 2015 Full Faculty Senate, to the floor.**

**Vote:** Approved

**Resolution: A Resolution from the University of Maine Faculty Senate calling upon the Administration and Board of Trustees to Support Divestment from the Top 200 Publicly Traded Fossil Fuel Companies**

**THEREFORE**, BE IT RESOLVED that the University of Maine Faculty Senate, in support of Divest UMaine, calls upon the University of Maine System's Board of Trustees to stop any new investment in fossil fuel companies and to set a goal of full divestment within 5 years.

**Vote:** Approved (Yea 14, Nay 8, Abstain 3)

[Divestment Resolution Senate Coughlan 29April2015](#)

## 2013 – 2014 Motions

**September 18, 2013 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

### **RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE TO PRESIDENT FERGUSON**

**PREAMBLE**



The University of Maine System (UMS) Information Technology (IT) Transformation Plan, “A Redesign of Information Technology Service Delivery,” was approved by the UMS Board of Trustees, January 2013. “A Redesign of Information Technology Service Delivery” is in its first phase of implementation, directed by UMS Chief Information Officer (CIO) Richard Thompson, by explicit instruction of Chancellor James Page. The plan was developed in response to the Chancellor’s December 2012 revised charter, after his rejection of the recommendations of an administrative IT review committee representing all campuses, formed by charter of the Chancellor May 2012. The vision of the approved plan, authored by the CIO, is “[t]o deliver seamless, high-quality and effective information technology infrastructure and services that matter to students, faculty and administrative users.” (“Administrative Review: Information Technology Services,” 2). The approved plan proposes “transformational change that establishes an accountable person within a framework that provides high engagement and oversight from campus leadership, as well as a commitment to efficiencies, savings, and a greater focus on academic programs and activities” (ibid, 4) a “new focus on academic technology” with the planned outcome of “a seamless information technology delivery system which is responsive to the needs of leadership, faculty, students and administrators” (10). The plan identifies “change of governance, development of communication, accountability and oversight,” as key factors for achieving “a streamlined and efficient system of service delivery and asset management” (15) securing “efficiencies resulting in savings of at least 10% of current operating budgets” (7) by Fiscal 2016. The plan calls for modernization and transformation by systematically reassigning campus-level responsibilities for IT management, growth and delivery to system-level administration (the Office of the CIO), centralizing and standardizing services, procurement and funding, and policies and practices; by consolidating to system-level the management and delivery of campus and system infrastructure, support, data center operations, and communications systems; by unifying delivery of end-user technology across campuses; and by centrally organizing academic IT, web development services and learning management systems through a shared services model, all to be achieved by applying best practices (Appendix 3—Recommendations, 25-29). The plan is to be fully implemented by April 2015.

**WHEREAS** the University of Maine System (“The System”) Information Technology (IT) Transformation Plan, A Redesign of Information Technology Service Delivery (“The Plan”), is currently in its initial phase of implementation; and

**WHEREAS** aspects of The Plan implemented since inception have included establishment of a multi-campus IT Director, an Academic Information Technology Service Management Committee, a CIO council, a communications plan for leaders, administrators, technical staff and innovators, a campus commonalities report for identifying, reviewing and organizing IT services into a shared services model with campus IT management, and establishment in part of a new organizational structure; and

**WHEREAS** aspects of The Plan implemented since May 2013 have included governance changes impacting oversight at the campus level; and

**WHEREAS** aspects of The Plan implemented since May 2013 have included changes to infrastructure impacting or potentially impacting academic IT at the campus level; and

**WHEREAS** aspects of The Plan implemented since May 2013 impacting campus oversight and/or academic IT have been enacted without either soliciting input from or informing in a timely fashion University of Maine faculty representatives to the Academic Information Technology Service Management Committee;

**AND FURTHER,**

**WHEREAS** The Plan systemically removes autonomy and authority over development, management and delivery of academic IT infrastructure and services from University of Maine vests such autonomy and authority in The System;

**AND FURTHER,**

**WHEREAS** The Plan does not quantify or otherwise consider consequences of cost-management decision-making on the effectiveness of academic IT use and development, nor the potentially mitigating effects on proposed cost-savings due to academic IT-educational services solutions mismatches; and

**WHEREAS** The Plan is not informed by any study or review of current academic IT practices and needs of faculty at University of Maine and other campuses; and

**WHEREAS** The Plan is without mechanism for shared, direct communication between system-level administrators of The Plan and campus faculty, *despite recommendation from the May 2012 review committee to “Form constituent-based advisory opportunities for consumers of IT services. These should include formally assembled groups of students, faculty, and administrative staff to have the ability for their needs to be heard and to provide priority and voice to their ideas and input”* (“Administrative Review,” 10); and

**AND FURTHER,**

**WHEREAS** academic IT network and digital communications supporting are today integrated into daily classroom activities of more than 50% of University of Maine campus-based courses; and

**WHEREAS** The Plan makes no acknowledgement of the deep daily integration of academic IT in daily classroom activities; and

**WHEREAS** seamless, high-quality and effective information technology infrastructure and services via campus-based network and digital communications are further relied upon by University of Maine students in their daily and academic lives and equally by University of Maine faculty in their daily and professional lives; and

**WHEREAS** the vision of The Plan is precisely to deliver seamless, high-quality and effective information technology infrastructure and services that matter to students, faculty and administrative users; and

**WHEREAS** disruption of access to academic IT resources and services implies immediate disruption of delivery of educational materials and services for both campus-based and distance-learning courses; and

**WHEREAS** such disruption of services compromises the effectiveness of the teaching faculty, the reputation of affected campuses, and faith in The System's ability to effectively oversee and manage IT centrally;

**AND FURTHER,**

**WHEREAS** repeated disruption of IT infrastructure network services occurred throughout the University of Maine campus during the first two weeks of the Fall 2013 semester; and

**WHEREAS** such disruptions severely negatively impacted hundreds of classes and distance-learning offerings, some repeatedly, during the first two weeks of the Fall 2013 semester; and

**WHEREAS** no organized system-level communication about or response to issues was evident to UM faculty or other campus-level IT stakeholders during the first two weeks of the Fall 2013 semester; and

**WHEREAS** System-level response to campus-wide disruptions in IT infrastructure network services was slow and inadequate, appeared to have insufficient direct knowledge of campus-level events with a concomitant lack of urgency in responsiveness, appeared inaccessible to general end-users seeking remedy from the consequences of disruptions in service, and appeared slow to acknowledge the scope of campus-level disruptions; and

**WHEREAS** these recent events have made superabundantly evident the need for robust mechanisms whereby faculty and other campus-level stakeholders can provide continuous input and receive timely feedback to System-level administrators implementing The Plan throughout all phases, in formats best promoting effective communication of stakeholder and end-user needs, issues, solutions and innovations;

**AND FINALLY,**

**WHEREAS** this Body has previously brought to the attention of the University of Maine administration, specifically the Office of Administration & Finance, and the Office of the Provost, concerns about lack of process and communication with regard to implementation of The Plan, and received assurances from University of Maine administration that faculty would be duly included and informed through conduits to be instituted as a campus-level priority; and

**WHEREAS** it has been the experience to date among UM faculty that campus-level administrative assurances of input & inform have not been adequately realized in practice;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the University of Maine Faculty Senate prevail upon the Office of the President to 1. Immediately convene an open meeting of campus-wide academic IT stakeholders before October 1 to discuss concerns with current implementation strategies and timelines of The Plan; and, 2. Begin co-development of a process for creating a proper, permanent communications mechanism between faculty campus administration and System-level administrators of The Plan, to maximize benefit and positive impact of technology integration and transformation of the "Redesign of Information Technology Service Delivery" on the teaching and research missions of the University of Maine.

**SUBMITTED BY: Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Ad Hoc IT Committee of Faculty Senate of the University of Maine.**

**Discussion**

This resolution came from faculty frustration, disruption to classes during the first week, and no reporting method when there's a disruption. There needs to be reliable communications when IT disruptions are coming. President Ferguson didn't believe a resolution was necessary but agrees there has been frustration and will be meeting as soon as possible with Dick Thompson. There were assurances that something like this would not happen but it did. The System needs to come have a conversation about the issues. Janet Waldron agreed, clear communication is needed and so far it's not acceptable. UMaine Strategic Plan will guide the campus direction, IT Governance Council and IT Effectiveness Council. The Councils have been generated and will need to work with UMaine to enforce that campus is driving the technology needs. John Gregory stated that communication is a serious issue but not sure the outage could have been avoided since they were not tied to the restructuring. PeopleSoft and other services were already here but we do need better communication moving forward.

It was stated that the Resolution was a stronger tool if it's not passed today. If postponed, while waiting to see how a meeting with the System Office goes, the Resolution becomes stronger.

**Vote: Resolution Approved**

**Response to Motion by the Administration OR Responses to Motions by the Administration**

[Response On IT Motion](#)

**October 16, 2013 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Motion to support the proposed Departmental Structure for the College of Education and Human Development.**  **Program Creation & Reorganization Review Committee**

Background

COEHD does not have departments. Three new departments are proposed, including A) Exercise Science and STEM Education; B) Teacher and Counselor Education; and C): Educational Leadership, Higher Education and Human Development. The COEHD proposal was posted on the PCRRC website on August 21, and the open meeting was held on October 4, 2013, attended by Dean Nichols and seven faculty including the new chairs, and four PCRRC committee members. Everyone at the meeting was in favor of the new departmental organization. Concern was raised regarding departmental names to assure that the disciplines are clear to students. It was agreed that naming and content of the departments was an ongoing project, but that the number of departments and their makeup took into consideration existing programs and faculty. The PCRRC committee voted to recommend that the Faculty Senate support the full proposal for the creation of new departments in the College of Education and Human Development

Motion:

The Full Faculty Senate supports the full proposal for the creation of new departments in the College of Education and Human Development.

**Motion: Approved**

## **MOTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE FROM THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE TO PRESIDENT FERGUSON**

Motion of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

In April, 2009, the Faculty Senate of the University of Maine and the President of the University and its administration agreed to share governance in all academic affairs. The principles of shared governance are documented in the *University of Maine Shared Governance Policy* (available at <<https://umaine.edu/facultysenate/wp-content/uploads/sites/218/2010/12/SharedGovernanceUMaine.pdf>><http://umaine.edu/facultysenate/files/2010/12/SharedGovernanceUMaine.pdf>). The sense of trust and collaboration captured in this policy is emphasized by terms such as “shared confidence,” “mutual respect,” “mutual desire to collaborate,” “collaborative process.”

Due to a perceived need to move quickly, both administrators and faculty agree that during the summer of 2013 a number of administrative searches were not performed in full accordance with the agreed-on shared governance policies. This motion should not be interpreted as a statement for or against any individual appointed to a position. The failure to follow the *Shared Governance Policy* did not provide the faculty sufficient input or information to make a determination of the appropriateness of appointments. The *Shared Governance Policy* must be followed in order to ensure a fair, open, and collaborative process.

**THEREFORE IT IS MOVED** that the Faculty Senate requires that the principles of shared governance detailed in the *University of Maine Shared Governance Policy* be followed in the future. There is no emergency or expediency justifying circumvention of these core principles, no matter the time of year.

The sections of the *Shared Governance Policy* relevant to the selection of deans, provost, associate provost and other vice presidents and appended as part of this motion are as follows:

From Section II E (a) which states:

The faculty and administration will collaborate in the recruitment and selection of deans, the provost, associate provosts, and other vice presidents. Administrative searches are normally competitive and include open sessions to allow faculty members and other appropriate sectors within the university community to meet and give input regarding candidates. Search committees for administrators will include faculty chosen by accepted faculty governance procedures, as specified in Section A. Faculty representatives shall comprise at least half of each search committee for deans and associate provosts.

Section A in the above paragraph refers to Section II A which states:

Representation of the faculty at all levels of University shared governance will be: a) chosen by direct election by the faculty to the Faculty Senate; b) appointed by an elected faculty officer; or c) appointed by an administrator from a list of several nominated by the Committee on Committees of the Senate. For some committees, faculty members may be appointed directly by the administration or other representative body, as long as there are also faculty representatives on these committees appointed according to a, b, or c above.

**Motion: Approved**

### **Response to Motion by the Administration OR Responses to Motions by the Administration**

[Response On Shared Governance and College Of Ed](#)

## **November 13, 2013 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

### **Motion to Update the Policy on Requirements for a University of Maine Undergraduate Degree**

#### **Background**

The Faculty Senate Constitution, Section 1, Article 3 on Jurisdiction states as follows:

Degree requirements. Subject to other provisions of this Constitution, the Senate shall have the authority to act in behalf of the faculty in establishing University-wide degree requirements.

As the Faculty Senate revises and updates the Faculty Handbook, it intends to adopt and reaffirm policies related to degree requirement and curriculum matters that are already in place subject to minor revisions and updates. Among the policies found in the existing Student Handbook published at <http://www.umaine.edu/handbook/> (including but not limited to the section on Awarding of Degrees found at <http://umaine.edu/handbook/academics/awarding-of-degrees/>) are those that relate to the granting of University of Maine undergraduate degrees.

### **Motion**

The Faculty Senate moves that the policies on granting University of Maine undergraduate degrees are hereby adopted and reconfirmed with minor changes as follows:

#### **Policy on Requirements for a University of Maine Undergraduate Degree**

The faculty of the University of Maine determines the requirements for all degrees awarded by the University. The faculty determines that an undergraduate baccalaureate degree requires all of the following:

The student must accumulate a minimum of 120 credit hours. The program in which the student is registered may have additional requirements.

The student must receive acceptable grades in all courses required by his or her academic major.

The student must achieve an accumulative average of not less than 2.0 in University of Maine courses. The program in which the student is registered may have additional requirements.

A minimum of 30 credits originating from the University of Maine Campus is required for the attainment of any bachelor's degree. This policy can be fulfilled in one of two ways: 1) by taking 30 credits in the senior year, or 2) by taking 30 credits at the 300 to 400 level during any year of study.

There are two exceptions to this policy:

Exception 1. Students who have already completed three or more years at the University of Maine (minimum of 90 credits of University of Maine courses) when, in the opinion of the student's academic program faculty in consultation with the student's dean, there is sufficient and valid reason to complete the senior year elsewhere.

Exception 2. Students who have completed a minimum of three years of work at the University of Maine and who have been admitted to an accredited professional school of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, or divinity. With the approval of the student's dean in consultation with the student's program faculty, these students may qualify for the appropriate bachelor's degree at the University of Maine upon receipt of the professional degree.

Transfer credits applicable to the granting of a University of Maine undergraduate degree normally must be from a school accredited by one of the following regional accrediting bodies:

Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools  
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools  
New England Association of Schools and Colleges  
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities  
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

For international colleges or universities, the international equivalent of regional accreditation or Ministry of Education recognition will be considered.

If course work was completed at a school not regionally accredited, a student may specifically request that their course work be considered for transfer. These recommendations include, but are not limited to:

1. The educational quality of the sending institution.
2. The comparability of credit to be transferred to the University of Maine.
3. Applicability of the credit in relation to the programs being offered at the University of Maine.
4. Additional documentation that the student may be required to provide regarding the course work for transferability.

See Transfer Credit Policy for details on transferring in credits from other schools or for courses taken while in the military service.

### **Discussion:**

This policy is on the books but periodically revised. It's a common policy across the US but UMaine's policy didn't appear to have ever been looked at by UMaine faculty. The transfer credits from accredited schools has been tightened to the big 6 accreditations since several schools cite accreditation but bodies granting those are unknown.

Comment:

Noticing that a lot of schools claim “membership” but not accreditations.  
Exception 2 came from the BOT back in the 70’s and probably has only been used once, if ever.

Q.  
Does this affect students that travel abroad, and how would that work?

A.  
No.

Comment: Any student wanting to Study Abroad has to go through the preapproval process anyway.

Q.  
Provost Hecker asked, if the Motion vetted by Faculty or the Academic Affairs Committee, and why Senate wants this done so quickly?

A.  
There have been discussions on what constitutes a degree from outside the University so Faculty Senate discussed adopting a policy. The motion went to Executive Committee but not active Academic Affairs Committee. Individuals can put forth a motion, which is then discussed, on the floor. These policies have changed over time and it’s not known by who or when. This gives ownership to the Faculty and Senate.

Comment: This issue has come up in discussion at the BOT level. There is a policy in the Student Handbook but it’s unclear who wrote that policy. The topic was discussed at an Elected Members meeting.

Q.  
The Student Catalog needs be updated so should there be a date added to this?

Also this should follow the State Department of Education policy?

A.  
The catalog comes out in September and is on a yearly calendar, correct? Students under the previous catalog follow that catalog. This new policy would apply to those incoming students once it’s in the catalog.

Comment:

This is an existing policy that does not change just reiterates what constitutes a degree from UMaine.

#### **Motion to Amend the Motion on the floor from:**

A minimum of 30 credits originating from the University of Maine Campus is required for the attainment of any bachelor’s degree. This policy can be fulfilled in one of two ways: 1) by taking 30 credits in the senior year, or 2) by taking 30 credits at the 300 to 400 level during any year of study.

#### **To:**

A minimum of 30 credits originating from the University of Maine Campus is required for the attainment of any bachelor’s degree. This policy can be fulfilled by taking 30 credits at the 300 or higher level over any year of study.

#### **Discussion:**

Q.  
Not seeing the need for the change.

A.  
This is how things come to the Senate, taking a 20-year policy and putting it back on the floor. Instead of having someone change the policy at will the faculty is taking ownership. There have been discussions regarding this issue so there’s a need for the policy.

Comment: Not sure this is something that needs Administration approval per Faculty Senate By-laws. That should be double-checked but pretty sure that’s the case.

#### **Motion: Approved**

#### **Motion to accept a General Definition for Community Engagement Service and Outreach Committee Recommendation, November 2013**

#### **Rationale:**

The Service and Outreach Committee of the Faculty Senate is recommending passage of the following motion, which includes a general definition for Community Engagement at the University of Maine. We are recommending this definition for Community Engagement because the new report from the President’s roundtable mentions the Carnegie definition and it is more inclusive of all the types of Community Engagement activities that might be engaged in or through a land grant institution like the University of Maine. The definition can be found below and at the Carnegie website:

Community Engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching). [http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community\\_engagement.php?key=1213](http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php?key=1213)

## **Motion:**

The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine adopts the following general definition for Community Engagement. This definition will serve as a guide in the development of Community Engagement opportunities and partnerships between students, University of Maine faculty and staff, and communities throughout the State of Maine and beyond. Community Engagement at the University of Maine is defined as *the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity* (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching).

## **Discussion:**

### **Motion: Approved**

### **Response to Motion by the Administration OR Responses to Motions by the Administration**

[Response On UM Undergrad Degree & Com Engmnt](#)

## **December 18, 2013 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

To: Faculty Senate  Date: April 3, 2013

Below please find a motion to accept revised wording for a change of grade. The current policy can be found below in the discussion.

### **Motion: The Faculty Senate approves the following language for the Undergraduate Catalog and, when revised, the faculty Handbook:**

#### **The Change of Grade Policy**

Instructors desiring to change a grade after official posting should submit a grade change request to the MaineStreet Grade Roster. Normally, grade changes are a result of clerical errors or errors of omission. Grade changes made beyond six months of the end of a semester require approval from the Associate Dean or designee. The decision of the Associate Dean may be appealed to the faculty of the Curriculum Committee of the faculty member's college (or equivalent academic unit) which shall be the final authority.

When entering the grade change on MaineStreet, the instructor should enter a brief written rationale containing their reasons for wanting to change the grade.

If a student wishes to improve a grade, then the option to repeat the course should be considered. For policy regarding incomplete grades, please see the incomplete grade policy in this catalog.

#### **Discussion and Notes**

*Existing policy as cited in the 1988 Faculty Handbook:*

"All grades changed by an instructor should state the reason for the change, and must be approved by the Dean of the College. The only exception to this change is a change from an Incomplete to a letter grade (see section on change of Incomplete grades which follows.)

The purpose of this procedure is to assure that grade changes are clearly justified for academic reasons. A change of grade should be a rarity, made only when legitimate mistakes such as computational errors, cause the initial grade to be incorrect. Change of Grade cards (YELLOW CARDS) are available in the Dean's Office. After the card has all the appropriate signatures, it is forwarded by the Dean's Office to the Registrar's Office."

The policy has to be changed to reflect the move from cards to MaineStreet. But the new policy also allows a six-month window for a grade change by the professor with no required approval. After six months the grade change will be reviewed, but a potential denial by an Associate Dean can be appealed to a faculty group—the faculty of the College Curriculum Committee.

Q.

Was this initiated by Stuart Marrs?

A.

Yes but think it originated from Student Records.

Provost Hecker commented that he heard from four Deans with concerns regarding the policy. 1. Rationale for the 6-months, 2. Yellow cards previously used had a place for the Deans signature not the Assoc. Dean, 3. May be out of the scope of work for some College Curriculum Committee's, 4. What if there's a disagreement by the Assoc Dean and then goes to a Curriculum Committee, will the committee overrule the Assoc Dean? 5. Responsibility should rest with the individual, 6. Rare case of disagreement may be unpopular decision. Administrators/Deans get paid to take the heat.

A.

Six months was based on some students that may not mention the issue until the next semester, that can be three or four months. Sometimes it's a matter of recording a grade incorrectly. Rick Borgman commented that if a student doesn't like a grade they can present it to a dean immediately, you don't need a policy for that.

Comment: this should be a peer issues.

**Motion: The motion was tabled.**

**Motion: Military Credit: Policy Adjustment From: The Academic Affairs Committee**

Date: April 3, 2013

Below please find a motion to accept revised wording for policy re. Military Credit. This language has been revised to reflect faculty Senate concerns. The current policy can be found below in the discussion.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate approves the following language for the Undergraduate Catalog: Military Credit:

Credit allowed will be based on recommendations of the American Council on Education (ACE) and National College Credit Recommendation Service (National CCRS, formerly National PONSi) and will correspond to subject areas offered at the University of Maine. Only courses recommended at the upper or lower baccalaureate level will be considered for transfer credit. A maximum of 15 credits will be allowed as military transfer credit (not including prior experiential learning and credit for standardized tests) and the courses will count as elective credit only unless an exception is made. The process for an exception is as follows: the student should contact his or her college or school Associate Dean who will forward the material to the appropriate department chair, unit director, or faculty member who will make the appropriate decision.

Credit for military experience: credit for learning due to duties or a position in the military is considered prior learning and will be considered in the same way as other prior experiential learning. See subsection "Prior Learning Credit" in this section.

**Discussion and Notes**

**Current Policy**

**Military Credit:**

Credit for military experience or corporate training programs: Normally will be allowed according to the recommendations of the American Council on Education (ACE) and National Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONSi). Credit allowed in this way normally counts for elective credit only. Courses considered to be at the upper baccalaureate level will be the only courses considered for transfer credit. All military students will receive 2 credits of KPE 100X for basics/recruit training.

The revised wording removes any reference to corporate training programs, limits credit to 15 credits, and now allows for both upper and lower baccalaureate level courses to be accepted.

The credit limit protects the students in this way: these credits come in as free electives in most all cases. Having too many free electives only increases overall credits without moving a student toward graduation. This has financial aid implications.

As always, and as is now clearly stated, credits must correspond to subject areas offered at the University of Maine. This policy refers only to coursework. Credit for work experience is covered through the university's prior experiential learning policy.

Who or what is doing the reviewing and recommending? ACE (The American Council on Education) is a nationally known and accepted organization that reviews courses to see if they are at a level of rigor and content equal to a college course and then recommends appropriate college credit. National CCRS is a similar organization developed by the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York.

Why change the policy now? A system-wide group was tasked by the Transfer Steering Committee to look into military credit. That group recommended the expansion to upper and lower baccalaureate courses. But it clearly left all specifics of policy to the campuses. This is totally our wording and our policy.

**Motion: Approved**

**University of Maine System**

**General Education and Credit Transfer Working Group Progress Report and Suggested Faculty Motions on the Campuses**

**Background**

All University of Maine System (UMS) Universities are required to meet the accreditation requirements of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC).

The University of Maine System has convened a UMS Credit Transfer and General Education Working Group. The immediate goal of the group's effort is to better facilitate transparency and ease in the transfer of credit for meeting general education requirements among the UMS campuses. The members of this group are listed below in Appendix A. The group also is actively engaging the registrars and transfer credit administrative staff from each of the UMS campuses.

The group was formed partially to respond to the language of Maine LD 90 that was incorporated within the language of the last Maine budget legislation. The language in part states:

Articulation agreements for general education must be in place no later than January 1, 2014 within the system and the university separately, and by September 1, 2014 between the university and the system. Articulation agreements for the science, technology, engineering and mathematics programs must be in place no later than September 1, 2014.

The meaning of the term “articulation agreement” is unclear in the legislation and thus is left largely up to the University of Maine System and its universities to define. This UMS working group is concerned only with the first sentence in the above quoted legislation while UMS “major-to-major” working groups are responding to the language of the second sentence.

To date, the UMS Credit Transfer and General Education Working Group has documented the general education requirements on each campus. (See the draft document at <http://umaine.edu/facultysenate/wp-content/uploads/sites/218/2013/11/UMSGenEdCampusRqrmnts.docx>)

The working group has also identified the individual courses and/or groups of courses that meet the general education requirements on each UMS campus (See the spreadsheet document at <http://umaine.edu/facultysenate/wp-content/uploads/sites/218/2013/11/UMSGenEdCourseEquivs.xlsx>)

## **Discussion**

At the outset it should be noted that while there are differences in the general education categories across the seven campuses, and while the student learning outcomes for commonly shared requirements may differ, all UMS units have identified student learning outcomes and the campuses are in compliance with the standards for general education defined by NEASC. The group believes it is essential that each campus maintain its own general education curriculum, representative of its specific mission and identity, while also reflecting our shared compliance with accreditation standards. Accordingly, this document reflects both our dedication to transparency among the requirements of our individual general education curricula as well as the greatest possible level of transferability among our campuses at this level.

In the past, determining which undergraduate courses on another campus would be accepted for credit as equivalent to a course on your campus was accomplished on an ad hoc basis, “as needed” when students applied to transfer courses to your campus. Before accepting the course as equivalent, the faculty unit teaching the course would be consulted to ensure that the course would be accepted as equivalent. The courses that have transferred in the past and their equivalencies were listed in Maine Street (See Faculty Center > Advisor Center > Transfer Course Equivalencies)

Rather than continue this ad hoc approach, the registrars and transfer credit administrators have recently looked at every course at every other UMS campus to determine whether those courses at the other campuses would be accepted as equivalents on their home campus and explicitly for which courses, if any. The academic program units are consulted in the instance of questionable equivalent courses.

An immediate goal of each UMS campus is to mark each course within PeopleSoft that meets their general education requirements. Once accomplished, anyone will be able to see whether any course on any other UMS campus meets a general education requirement on that campus and, if so, which specific general education requirement is met. As an example, Appendix B lists the General Education requirements for the University of Maine campus, the explicit UMaine courses that satisfy those requirements, and courses at the other UMS campuses that will transfer as equivalent to the UMaine General Education courses. A similar table has been prepared for each of the UMS campuses.

### **ASSUMPTION 1: BLOCK TRANSFER IN MEETING GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS**

All University of Maine System (UMS) Universities meet the accreditation requirements of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC). Therefore, a matriculated student that meets ALL of the general education course requirements at a University of Maine System institution before transferring to another UMS campus is deemed to have fulfilled ALL of the general education requirements for graduation at any of the other campuses.

Thus the student need not take any further courses to fulfill general education requirements. This is true even though general education requirements may differ substantially among the campuses. It is understood that some, many or all of the courses might transfer only as 1xxx courses that perhaps count only as elective courses and would not necessarily substitute directly for another course required for graduation in a specific major. A transferring student might still be required to take some upper level general education courses because the courses are also required by the major degree program. As example, an intensive writing course in the major or a capstone course in the major might often be required by the major degree even though these courses might also qualify as general education courses for non-transfer students.

Therefore, if a matriculated student at any University of Maine System institution has completed 100% of the general education requirements at that institution, the UMS institution to which the student is transferring will consider all general education requirements completed. It will be the student’s responsibility to ask the Registrar’s Office or Office of Student Records at the UMS institution where the general education requirements were completed to verify the completion of these requirements to the appropriate office at the new UMS institution.

Note: The above block transfer practice is little different from the current block transfer practice among the UMS campuses when a student completes a degree on one campus and then transfers to another UMS campus to earn an additional undergraduate degree. Such a student is given full faith and credit for having already completed their general education requirements and need not take meet the general education requirements again assuming that the campus from which they are transferring is NEASC accredited. They need only complete the requirements of the major on the new campus plus acquire the required number of credits for graduation. The only difference with the above block transfer procedure from current practice is that the registrar at the UMS campus from which the student is transferring may now be called upon, in appropriate cases, to verify that all general education requirements of the university have been met by the student if indeed the entire degree has not been completed on that campus.

Experience has shown that very few transfer students currently complete ALL general education course requirements on a single UMS campus prior to transferring to another UMS campus for completion of an undergraduate degree. Thus for many transfer students it is necessary to determine on a course-by-course basis if they have met specific general education requirements that they need not fulfill again.

### **ASSUMPTION 2: COURSE-BY-COURSE TRANSFERS TO FULFILL GENERAL EDUCATION CATEGORY REQUIREMENTS**

The assumption is made that if a course on the campus to which a student is transferring meets a general education requirement AND the academic unit in consultation with the instructor(s) of the course on the campus to which the student is transferring deems that the course



previously taken by the student at another UMS campus is equivalent, the student obtains credit for both the course as being equivalent and gets credit for meeting that general education category requirement on the receiving campus. This is true even if the course did not fulfill a similar general education requirement on the campus from which the student is departing and/or fulfill similar student outcome objectives.

Note: This assumption matches the current practice supported among all of the UMS campuses.

#### **ASSUMPTION 3: COURSE TRANSFER ARTICULATION DATABASE: AUTOMATION TO PROVIDE CLARITY AND TRANSPARENCY**

The assumption is made that PeopleSoft and/or MaineStreet will be enabled to allow students, faculty, administrators and the general public to readily see what courses taken on any UMS campus will fulfill the general education requirements on any other UMS campus. An example of all courses taken at other UMS campuses meeting the general education requirements on the University of Maine campus is shown in Appendix B. Similar simple course transfer charts for all of the other campuses are accessible at the General Education links at <https://umaine.edu/csit/transfer-of-course-credits-among-the-university-programs/>.

While the examples shown at the above link were compiled by hand as examples, the assumption is that similar tables will be generated on the fly by drawing from the up-to-date database for course transfers whenever a member of the public wants to see which courses will transfer to other UMS campuses to meet general education requirements. Thus, general education course transfer tables, whether expressed in html online or as a pdf file for download, will always be up to date. The general public will have the same access to the detailed course transfer information on the web as that provided to a student currently enrolled at a UMS campus, a potential new student or transfer, a parent, a legislator or a faculty member.

#### **Motions Recommended for Faculty Senates on the UMS Campuses to Accommodate the Mandates of the Maine Legislature**

##### **Faculty Authority:**

The responsibility for the determination of the requirements which students must meet to be eligible for an academic degree rests with the faculties of each of the several units of the University of Maine System. (Board of Trustees of the University of Maine System, Policy Manual, Section 303 Academic Degrees) As with all respected Universities across the nation and globe, credentialed faculty members are involved intimately in credentialing on a course-by-course and curriculum-by-curriculum basis each successive generation of university graduates. In it's Constitution approved by the Chancellor of the University of Maine System pursuant to Board of Trustees' Policies, it is clear that in regard to matters concerning student academic standards and performance, recommendations of the Faculty Senate become University policy except when explicitly disapproved by the President of the University.

##### **Motion Discussion:**

Motion 1 as listed below is likely to have very little practical effect currently on course transfers at most UMS campuses. The motion will allow however each UMS campus to state that they grant full credit for completion of general education requirements by a student on any other UMS campus. It is very similar to the current practice of granting block transfer credit for fulfilling general education requirements for a student that has completed a degree on another NEASC accredited UMS campus. Motion 2 represents the status quo on how credits for general education courses are accepted for transfer currently to each of the UMS campuses but describes the current practice as one involving course-by-course articulation agreements in order to accommodate the legislative mandate. Motion 3 concerning the course transfer articulation database will allow course-to-course articulation agreements among the UMS campus units to always be up-to-date. Addition of publicly accessible transfer tables to be automatically generated on-the-fly will greatly enhance transparency for students when investigating the transfer of courses among the campuses, allow them to plan ahead and will make transfer processes far more efficient.

##### **Motion 1: Block Transfer in Meeting General Education Requirements**

If a matriculated student at another University of Maine System institution has completed 100% of the general education requirements and assuming that the campus from which the student is transferring is accredited by NEASC, our campus will provide 100% reciprocity and acceptance of that student's completion of the General Education requirements such that the student transferring is deemed to have completed all general education requirements. It will be the student's responsibility to ask the Registrar's Office or Office of Student Records at the UMS institution where the general education requirements were completed to verify and certify the completion of these requirements to the appropriate office at our campus. It should be noted that a transfer student might still be required to take some upper level General Education courses because the courses are also required by the student's major degree program or are required of all students earning a degree at the institution.

##### **Motion: Approved**

##### **Motion 2: Course-by-Course Articulation Agreements for Transfer of General Education Courses**

A student completing only some general education requirements on one or several University of Maine System NEASC accredited campus's before transferring must meet all of the general education requirements on the campus to which they are transferring. However, if a course on the campus to which a student is transferring meets a general education requirement AND the academic unit on the campus to which the student is transferring (in consultation with the instructor(s) of the course) determines that the course previously taken by the student is equivalent, the student obtains credit for both the course as being equivalent and receives credit for meeting that general education category requirement on the receiving campus. Such a determination constitutes a course-by-course articulation agreement for further transfer students until the faculty unit decides otherwise.

##### **Motion: Approved**

##### **Motion 3: Development and Maintenance of a Course Transfer Articulation Database and Generation of User Friendly Course Transfer Tables**

Technology shall be enabled by UMS to allow potential and existing students to readily see what courses they may take on any UMS or Maine Community College Campus that will transfer to and fulfill specific general education requirements on any UMS campus to which they might eventually transfer. That is, the table shown in Appendix B should be generated for each UMS campus and then regenerated automatically on-the-fly from the database whenever a user seeks access such that the course transfer tables are always up-to-date.

**Motion: Approved**

[ResponseOnMilitary\\_Crd and Gen Ed Crd Transfer](#)

**January 29, 2014 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Resolution concerning Process for Updating the Faculty Handbook**

**Background**

The Faculty Senate on April 16, 2003 by a vote of 48 for and 1 abstention adopted the handbook which has been available since that time on the senate web site. This is the latest version of the faculty handbook which was adopted by the senate and thus serves as the faculty handbook for the University of Maine.

The senate will use this version of the handbook as the basis for incremental updates. The senate is further resolved that the handbook is in an electronic age a document which must serve as a master resource for policies on the University of Maine campus. Therefore ongoing revisions will be tracked in a revision history and the senate will remain the controlling repository for supporting documents.

**Resolution**

The Senate approves the process by which the handbook dated April 2003 will be updated with sections approved as revisions become available.

**Motion Approved**

**Motion to Number the Sections of the Faculty Handbook**

**Background**

The Faculty Senate on April 16, 2003 by a vote of 48 for and 1 abstention adopted the handbook which has been available since that time on the senate web site. The handbook states, "It is our intent that this will be an electronic document and that it will be updated once per semester by the CABC."

In order to facilitate updates the handbook sections should be numbered with each section of substance in the chapters containing a subsection number.

**Motion Approved**

**Motion**

To renumber the chapter now listed as a second chapter 4 as chapter 5 and to adopt the numbering system for the Faculty Handbook as follows:

***Chapter 1: An Introduction to the University of Maine and the University of Maine System***

- 1.1 The Roles of the University of Maine
- 1.2 Governance on Campus
- 1.3 The University of Maine Faculty Senate
- 1.4 Faculty Senate – Motion on Shared Governance – 1/29/2003
- 1.5 Appointment, Retention, Promotion, and Tenure

***Chapter 2: Faculty Privileges, Professional Ethics, and Responsibilities***

- 2.1 Academic Freedom
- 2.2 Free Speech and Assembly
- 2.3 Professional Ethics and Plagiarism
- 2.4 Research
- 2.5 Student Evaluation of the Faculty
- 2.6 Faculty Review of Administrators

***Chapter 3: Course Instruction Procedure and Guidelines***

- 3.1 Course/Instruction Procedures and Guidelines
  - 3.1.1 Course Modifications and New Courses
  - 3.1.2 Faculty Office Hours
  - 3.1.3 Advising Students
  - 3.1.4 Course Syllabi
  - 3.1.5 Distribution of the Syllabus
- 3.2 Class Periods
  - 3.2.1 Class List

### 3.2.2 Class Attendance

### 3.3 Disruptive Behavior

### 3.4 Cheating, Plagiarism, and Academic Integrity

### 3.5 Tests and Examinations

#### 3.5.1 Types of Examinations

#### 3.5.2 Examination Scheduling

#### 3.5.3 Absence from Final Examinations

#### 3.5.4 Machine Scoring of Examinations

#### 3.5.5 Examination File

### 3.6 Grades and Grading

#### 3.6.1 Approved Grading Symbols and Definitions

#### 3.6.2 Grading Policies

#### 3.6.3 Transfer Grades

### 3.7 Academic Achievement Awards

### 3.8 Textbooks and Academic Supplies

## ***Chapter 4: Policies, Guidelines, and Procedures***

### 4.1 Travel Policies

### 4.2 Cancellation of Classes Because of Weather

### 4.3 Alcohol and Drug Policies; Smoking Policy

### 4.4 Nondiscrimination Policy

### 4.5 Affirmative Action Policy

### 4.6 Harassment Policies

### 4.7 Hazing Policy.

### 4.8 Complaint Procedure..

### 4.9 Weapons Policy

### 4.10 Violence in the Workplace Policy

### 4.11 Whistleblower Protection Act

### 4.12 AIDS Policy

### 4.13 Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)

### 4.14 Media Communications Policy

### 4.15 Pet Policy

## ***Chapter 5: Helpful Information and Resources***

### 5.1 Maine Card

### 5.2 Parking on Campus

### 5.3 Campus Mail

### 5.4 Telephone System

### 5.5 Faculty Pay Schedule

### 5.6 Childcare Facilities on Campus

### 5.7 University Housing

### 5.8 Auditoriums and Performance Spaces

#### 5.8.1 Maine Center for the Arts/Hutchins Concert Hall

#### 5.8.2 Other Auditoriums and Theaters

#### 5.8.3 Minsky Music Recital Hall

#### 5.8.4 Hauck Auditorium

#### 5.8.5 Al Cyrus Pavilion Theater

### 5.9 Museum of Art

### 5.10 Recreational Facilities and Athletics

### 5.11 Grants, Contracts, and Extramural Funding

### 5.12 University IT

#### 5.12.1 University of Maine Network for Education and Technology (UNET)

#### 5.12.2 Department of Information Technologies (IT)

#### 5.12.3 Networking Services

#### 5.12.4 First Class

#### 5.12.5 Computer Connection

#### 5.12.6 Help Center

#### 5.12.7 Faculty Development Center

#### 5.12.8 Computer Repair Center

#### 5.12.9 Other Information Technologies Services

5.13 Fogler Library

5.13.1 URSUS

5.13.2 Mariner

5.13.3 Library Checkout Privileges

5.13.4 Interlibrary Loan

5.14 Recycling

5.15 Presidential Achievement Awards

5.15.1 Presidential Research and Creative Achievement Award

5.15.2 Presidential Outstanding Teaching Award

5.15.3 Presidential Public Service Achievement Award

5.16 Center for Teaching Excellence

## **Motion Approved**

### **Motion to Create a Chapter of the Faculty Handbook Devoted to Research and Scholarly Activity**

#### **Background**

One of the defining characteristics of the University of Maine as the only research intensive institution in Maine is the role of research in the life of the university. The current faculty handbook fails to separate research in a substantive manner in the document.

#### **Motion**

To modify the current organization of the handbook adding in a chapter 5 which considers issues related to research and scholarship by moving section 2.4 and 5.11 to become the new sections 5.1 and 5.2. The current chapter 5 will be renumbered as chapter 6. Existing sections 2.4 and 5.11 will be reserved for additional future content in those chapters of the handbook.

#### **Motion Approved**

[Response to Motions 01-29-14 copy.](#)

## **February 26, 2014 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

### **MOTION 1**

#### **Motion to Modify the Preamble to the Faculty Handbook**

From the Constitution and Bylaws Committee

#### **Background**

The preamble for the faculty handbook that was adopted on April 16, 2003 is out of date and does not properly define the process for modifying the handbook. The modified text addresses these issues.

#### **Motion**

To modify the preamble of the faculty handbook to read:

This Handbook is an information guide for University of Maine faculty, and does not supersede any collective bargaining agreements made by the Associated Faculty of the University of Maine (AFUM). The goal of the handbook is to capture key elements of administrative policy and faculty responsibility in a single resource that can provide guidance for all faculty at the University of Maine

This document has been assembled by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (CABC) of the Faculty Senate. It is our intent that this will be an electronic document and that it will be updated once per semester by the CABC. Minor changes, such as updating a URL associated with policy which does not significantly impact faculty responsibilities or independence will be made on an ad hoc basis. All substantive changes will be required to be brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate and will be subject to a vote on during regular faculty meetings.

Comments of any sort as well as additions or corrections are solicited. For simplicity, please clearly indicate what you wish to add or subtract including the current text and the proposed text. If substantive this information will be presented to the senate in the form of a motion and will be subject to a vote. All corrections should be directed to the chair of the CABC and copied to the president of the faculty senate.

#### **Motion Approved**

### **MOTION 2**

**Motion to Modify the *Research and Scholarship at UMaine* section of the Faculty Handbook** From the Research & Scholarship Committee  
Motion

#### **Motion:**

To modify the Research and Scholarship section of the faculty handbook to read:

### **Research and Scholarship at UMaine**

One of the three missions of the University of Maine is research, and faculty members are expected to conduct research and be involved in scholarly activities. This expectation is reflected in faculty evaluation and promotion procedures. The range of scholarly activities is wide and specific to the discipline; it may include, among others, exhibited artistic creations, book writing and scholarly papers in professional journals.

Faculty members are encouraged to involve both undergraduate and graduate students in research and scholarship activities. The center for undergraduate research (CUGR, <http://cugr.umaine.edu/>) provides research fellowships and organizes a yearly exhibit of undergraduate research at UMaine. Similarly, the Graduate School (<http://www.umaine.edu/graduate/>) provides research assistantships and publishes news regarding research performed by graduate students at UMaine.

The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) assists faculty and staff in seeking and managing research grants, contracts, and other extramural funding. ORSP serves as applicant, contract negotiator, and signatory authority for the University in such matters, and provides grant accounting services once an award is made. A detailed guide to resources for faculty who are currently, or have an interest in, conducting research detailing the different steps associated with research and award applications and management are provided in this document: [http://www.orsp.umesp.maine.edu/ORSPDocs/Info/ORSPTraining/ORSP\\_Resource\\_Guide.pdf](http://www.orsp.umesp.maine.edu/ORSPDocs/Info/ORSPTraining/ORSP_Resource_Guide.pdf).

Research activities at the University of Maine are governed by federal and state regulations, and University policies which have been instituted to ensure scientific integrity, safeguard the welfare of animal and human subjects, and protect the health and safety of faculty and staff, students, and visitors to campus.

The University of Maine adheres to a strict policy of compliance. All members of the University community are responsible for familiarizing themselves, and complying with all applicable regulations and policies. Failure to do so places not only the University, but also the individual community member at risk for violations which could result in substantial administrative, civil and criminal fines and penalties. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) website (<http://umaine.edu/orsp/compliance/about-compliance/>) provides information on key research compliance topics concerning animal and human subjects, hazardous materials, the responsible conduct of research, fiscal accountability, intellectual property, and export control regulations. ORSP also provides online training in compliance and sponsored project management which those engaged in research and/or pursuing extramural funding are strongly encouraged or are required to complete.

Some research endeavors require specialized equipment (e.g. hazardous materials, lasers) or activities (e.g. diving, human subjects) which are associated with significant risks. Such activities are monitored by UMaine's Office of Safety and Environmental Management (SEM) and may require specialized training prior to engaging in such research activity. For policies and training requirements, consult the SEM web site (<http://sem.umaine.edu/policies-guides-and-reports/>).

### ***Motion Approved***

#### **MOTION 3**

#### **Motion to Regularly Assess Faculty Satisfaction at the University of Maine**

From the UMaine Faculty Senate Environment Committee

#### **Background**

Faculty members at the University of Maine have expressed a desire to have a regular and standardized assessment of faculty satisfaction. The Environment Committee would like this regular survey to allow for

#### **Motion**

establishment of an initial standardized base line assessment of faculty satisfaction, provide a basis for national comparison with like institutions, and enable longitudinal comparisons over time at our own institution.

After reviewing the various standardized surveys discussed in the Hanover Research document titled *Assessing*

*Faculty and Staff Satisfaction (Feb 2012)* and the recent UMaine Rising Tide *Survey of Faculty Satisfaction*

(2011), we recommend that the survey administered by HERI (<http://www.heri.ucla.edu/facoverview.php>)

be regularly used to best meet the standardization and comparison goals sought by the faculty.

The Faculty Senate urges the Administration of the University of Maine to arrange for and fund participation by

University of Maine faculty at least once every three years in the core set of questions contained in the HERI

Faculty Survey Instrument. Further, we recommend the University's participation in the Campus Climate

Module, the Academic Advising Module and the STEM Module. In addition, we recommend that the University of Maine participate in one or more of the HERI student surveys.

### ***Motion Approved***

## MOTION 4

### Motion to Discard Certain Printed Periodicals

From the UMaine Faculty Senate Library Committee

#### Background and Rationale:

The Faculty Senate Library Advisory Committee recommends passage of the following motion, which allows Fogler library to discard journals that JSTOR has digitized and archived.

JSTOR (Journal Storage) is a not-for-profit shared digital library created in 1995 to help university and college libraries to free space on their shelves, save costs, and provide greater levels of access to content. By digitizing content to high standards and supporting its long-term preservation, JSTOR aids libraries and publishers of scholarly content transition their collections and publishing activities from print to digital operations.

JSTOR digital content is preserved in Portico (doorway to the resources), a digital repository supported by its publisher and library members, including the University of Maine. Print copies of the materials digitized in JSTOR are preserved in two official "dark archives," one at Harvard, and one at the University of California.

JSTOR currently includes more than 2,000 academic journals. Fogler Library has print holdings in its collection for nearly half of all titles in JSTOR, and has had most of the bound volumes in storage for several years.

#### Motion

The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine approves library discard of those printed periodical volumes for which there is duplicate content in the JSTOR electronic archives purchased by the library.

#### Motion Approved

[Response to Motions 02-26-2014](#)

## April 2, 2014 – Faculty Senate Meeting

### MOTION 1 Motion Concerning a Course Designator for Community Engagement/Service-Learning


Submitted by the Service and Outreach Committee

#### Background:

#### Community Engagement/Service-Learning Designator

UMaine received the Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement in 2008. A reclassification application will be submitted April 15, 2015.

#### UMaine's Definitions:

 **Community Engagement** describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; Approved by Faculty Senate, 2013).

[http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community\\_engagement.php?key=1213](http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php?key=1213) **Service-learning** is defined at the at the University of Maine as "a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities" (National Service-Learning Clearinghouse; Approved by Faculty Senate, October, 2011) <http://umaine.edu/facultysenate/motions-passed-2/2011-2012-motions/>

#### Why should UMaine have a service-learning designator? Helps to meet the vision of the Blue Sky Strategic Plan and land grant mission

#### In line with other land-grant universities

- Other *Engaged Universities* (Carnegie Classified) use a service-learning designator

#### Carnegie Reclassification for Community Engagement

- Having a process to identify a service-learning course will aid in the reclassification process in the future.

The Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement application asks for the number of service-learning courses taught; number of departments; number of faculty; number of students; as well as questions related to general education; core courses; courses in the major; capstone; internships/co-ops, study abroad, student research, student leadership courses, first year experience courses; graduate courses in service-learning.

#### Assessment/tracking

- A designator would aid in tracking students' participation and assessing learning outcomes as well as helping to determine impact on students, faculty, community and institution.

Assessment and tracking are needed for:

- Carnegie Reclassification
- NESAC accreditation (learning outcomes)
- Association of Public Land-Grant Universities Innovation & Economic Prosperity Designation (OIED)
- Grant writing/reports.

#### **Locate courses**

- A designator will help students locate these courses during registration. Many students are interested in working with the community on real-world issues.
- Students will know that they are signing up for a service-learning course when they register and that the course has a set of expectations.

#### **Transcripts:**

- Provides recognition of the service-learning experience on student transcripts (work with student records)

#### **Faculty Development**

- Facilitates faculty development and community partner professional development opportunities

#### **Advising**

- Advisors can locate and communicate about service-learning courses with students

#### **Rewards and Recognition**

- Facilitates faculty, student and community partner rewards, recognition and PR.

#### **Networking**

- Aid in the identification of resources and networks to further support service-learning efforts on campus.

#### **Identification and Best Practices**

- Carnegie Reclassification: 77 courses were viewed as being community engaged/service-learning courses in 2012-13
- Helps to ensure that the course meets recognized best practices, criteria, and definition

#### **A course would be designated SL when it meets the following criteria:**

- Graduate or undergraduate course
- Integrates meaningful service with and course content.
- The service addresses a community need.
- Demonstrates one or more collaborative partnerships: Mutual benefits for the community partner and the <sup>11</sup><sub>SEP</sub>Students. Follows processes that are agreed upon by the partner and the instructor.
- Student assessment and academic credit are based upon the demonstration of student learning, not on the <sup>11</sup><sub>SEP</sub>service hours.
- Critical reflection is part of the assessment process.
- Public dissemination of project, products or findings

**Motion:** The Service and Outreach Committee of the Faculty Senate moves that:<sup>11</sup><sub>SEP</sub>The undergraduate and graduate course approval and updating processes be revised to incorporate assessment of whether a course meets the above stated service learning criteria and, if so, the course should be designated as such within the undergraduate or graduate catalogs.

#### ***Motion Approved***

**MOTION 2<sup>11</sup><sub>SEP</sub> PCRRC Recommendation Regarding the Proposal to Eliminate the BA in Latin** Background: The proposal for program elimination of the BA in Latin originated with the 2009-2010 Academic Program, Prioritization Working Group (APPWG). Efforts to sustain the program are documented in the PCRRC archives. The open meeting to consider the program elimination of the BA degrees in German and Latin was held on Feb. 3, 2014. Jane Smith, Chair of the Department of Modern Languages and Classics, introduced the two program eliminations. Multiple people spoke of the importance of German to modern languages, while emphasizing the importance of Latin to the Classics and for training teachers in high schools where it remains an important language. It was acknowledged that enrollments are low and that the program has been maintained by teaching efforts beyond the call of duty by individual professors. Given low enrollment and current financial problems across disciplines, the importance of Latin, as a major, needs to be weighed against continued Latin instruction and its importance to a variety of classical studies and to students who choose to pursue Latin further at another institution. We emphasize the importance of Latin training and the potential for development through cross disciplinary pursuits in multiple fields of classical study, in art, history, philosophy and languages, but (by a divided vote) we accept the proposal to eliminate the major in Latin.**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the PCRRC to eliminate the BA in Latin.**Motion Approved****MOTION 3<sup>11</sup><sub>SEP</sub> PCRRC Recommendation Regarding the Proposal to Eliminate the BA in German**Background: The proposal for program elimination of the BA in German has a long history commencing with recommendation for program suspension in the 2009-2010 Academic Program, Prioritization Working Group (APPWG). Efforts to sustain the program are documented in the PCRRC archives, including the Proposal for Retention of the German Major, dated October 22, 2012, but only recently added to the PCRRC

website. By the time the Program Elimination Proposal for the Bachelor of Arts in German was submitted in February 11, 2013 the only two tenure-stream positions had been vacated and left unfilled, and the program was suspended in January 2013. The rationale, as stated, for eliminating the program was largely the loss of the two positions. The open meeting to consider the program elimination of the BA degrees in German and Latin was held on Feb. 3, 2014. Jane Smith, Chair of the Department of Modern Languages and Classics, introduced the two program eliminations. She noted that she was not in favor of their elimination, and emphasized the effort made to creatively redesign the German program. There were six speakers who all stressed the importance of German and foreign languages in general, and a letter from 34 faculty members supporting language major retention. The 2012 proposal to retain German stated that as of the 2012/2013 academic year, no public University in Maine offers a major in German, and that UMaine is the only flagship University in New England that does not offer a major in German. The Blue Sky Plan proposes to "Make international and/or cross-cultural opportunities central to the undergraduate experience." Although the BA in German is now suspended, we do not believe that it should be eliminated without further evaluation within the broader context of language needs and availability in the state of Maine. **Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the PCRRRC to keep the BA in German in suspension, rather than eliminating it, until May 30, 2015, pending the results of a Faculty-led campus and system review of language needs to support UMaine's mission. **Motion Approved**

#### **MOTION 4<sup>SEP</sup> PCRRRC Recommendation Regarding the Elimination of the B.S. in Forest Ecosystems**

Background: The proposal to eliminate this program was submitted to the PCRRRC by the Dean of the College of Natural Sciences, Forestry and Agriculture in October of 2012 and was held up with other program eliminations during the work to rule process. The open meeting was held on March 28, 2014, with all in attendance favoring the elimination of the program.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the PCRRRC to eliminate the B.S. in Forest Ecosystems in the School of Forest Resources.

**Motion Approved**

#### **MOTION 5<sup>SEP</sup> PCRRRC Recommendation Regarding the elimination of the B.S. in Wood Science and Technology**

Background: The proposal to eliminate this program was submitted to the PCRRRC by the Dean of the College of Natural Sciences, Forestry and Agriculture in December of 2012 and was held up with other program

eliminations during the work to rule process. The open meeting was held on March 28, 2014, with all in attendance favoring the elimination of the program.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the PCRRRC to eliminate the B.S. in Wood Science and Technology in the School of Forest Resources.

**Motion Approved**

#### **MOTION 6<sup>SEP</sup> PCRRRC Recommendation Regarding the elimination of the B.S. in Aquaculture in the School of Marine Sciences**

Background: The proposal to eliminate this program was submitted to the PCRRRC by the Dean of the College of Natural Sciences, Forestry and Agriculture in October of 2012 and was held up with other program eliminations during the work to rule process. The open meeting was held on March 28, 2014, with all in attendance favoring the elimination of the program.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the PCRRRC to eliminate the B.S. in Aquaculture in the School of Marine Sciences.

**Motion Approved**

#### **MOTION 7<sup>SEP</sup> PCRRRC Recommendation Regarding the creation of the M.S. in Spatial Informatics**

Background: The Full Program Proposal for the M.S. in Spatial Informatics (representing stage eight of the University of Maine's Fifteen Stage Process of New Academic Program Creation) was submitted to the PCRRRC on March 11, 2014. An informational meeting was held on March 19. The open meeting was held on March 28, 2014, with five in attendance, all in favor of the new program, and with proceedings and documentation posted on the PCRRRC website.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the PCRRRC to create the M.S. in Spatial Informatics in the School of Computing and Information Science.

**Motion Approved**

#### **MOTION 8<sup>SEP</sup> Constitution and Bylaws Committee Motion to Revise Section 2.1 and 2.2 of the Faculty Handbook**

##### **Background**

The Faculty Senate on April 16, 2003 by a vote of 48 for and 1 abstention adopted the handbook which has been available since that time on the senate web site. The handbook states, "It is our intent that this will be an electronic document and that it will be updated once per semester by the CABAC."



In order to facilitate updates the handbook sections should be numbered with each section of substance in the chapters containing a subsection number.

The purpose of this motion is to revise and replace the section 2.1 and 2.2 on Academic freedom and Free Speech and Assembly (current language found in the Faculty Handbook of 2003 at <http://umaine.edu/facultysenate/documents/>) to reflect recent consensus and changes in legal precedents:

**Whereas** we concur in the following reasoning, we replace the older section with clearer language:

**And whereas**, the long standing tradition and expectations of the faculty of the University of Maine is to fully exercise their Academic Freedom, a clear statement of that right and its corresponding obligation of candor and of personal ownership requires that section 2.1 and 2.2 be revised.

**Therefore be it resolved that the following language will replace the current language:**

#### Chapter 2: Faculty Academic Freedom Rights and Responsibilities

Sec 2.1.a Academic Freedom Sources: Members of the faculty individually enjoy and exercise all rights secured to them by the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Maine, and by the principles of academic freedom as they are generally understood in higher education, including professional behavior standards and the expectation of academic due process and just cause, as well as rights specifically granted to them by: Trustee action, University of Maine System rules, these policies and procedures, and relevant practices or established custom of their colleges or schools and departments.

2.1 b. Academic freedom is defined at the University of Maine as the freedom to discuss, meet with others and present scholarly and personal opinions and conclusions regarding all matters in the classroom and in public, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to reach conclusions according to one's scholarly discernment and according to one's own conscience on all matters, including university operations, policies and employment practices without any Institutional censure, discipline or restraint.

2.2. Academic Freedom of speech and assembly: Academic freedom also includes the right to speak, meet or write as a private citizen or within the context of one's activities as an employee of the university without institutional discipline or restraint on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to professional duties, the functioning of the university, and university positions and policies. Academic responsibility implies the faithful performance of professional duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that when one is speaking on matters of public interest or concern, one is speaking on behalf of oneself, not the institution.

**Motion:** Revision and replacement of the current Faculty Handbook language of section 2.1 and 2.2 with the above language is hereby approved by the Faculty Senate.

***Motion Approved***

#### **RESOLUTION**

##### **Executive Committee Resolution in Support of USM Faculty**

We, the members of the Faculty Senate of the University of Maine, offer support to our colleagues, students and staff at the University of Southern Maine (USM).

Faculty Members should be treated as the highest priority asset at any university. Without highly credentialed individuals to credential succeeding generations in society, any campus loses its core purpose. The reputation and relevance of any university depend on the reputation, relevance and diversity of its faculty. Without their core knowledge, compassion and commitment, a campus is merely a collection of expensive hollow buildings.

We call on the USM and the University of Maine System (UMS) administration to support fully the faculty-led core missions of teaching, research and service and treat as their highest priority the retention of a diverse, engaged and highly credentialed faculty; without them no university can survive and thrive.

***Resolution Approved***

[Faculty Senate 4.15.14-1 copy.](#)

#### **April 30, 2014 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

##### **MOTION 1**

##### **Motion to Support a Classroom Scheduling Recommendation**

Submitted by Academic Affairs Committee

##### **Background and Analysis:**

The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate was asked by faculty in the fall of 2012 to explore the possibility of adding more 1 ¼ hour class options to the schedule, that is, to shift at least some 50 minute MWF slots to two day a week 1 ¼ hour slots. We explored this possibility in a variety of ways (see below). Our conclusions are as follows:

- a. We feel, and the bulk of the faculty who provided input feel, that the longer, two day a week sessions provide a more effective classroom experience.
- b. We also feel that by increasing the number of more popular two-day a week scheduling options we can distribute classes better across the week. Note that in the fall of 2011 only 69 classes are offered across the campus at 1:10 or later in the MWF 50 minute slot. Only 20 are offered 2:10 or later. Meanwhile, there are 161 classes starting Tu/Th at 12:30 or later. Thus there is likely to be a slightly positive effect on spreading classroom utilization across the available times of the week. A simulation by Infosilem, a provider of scheduling software, modeled a change to MW afternoon classes instead of MWF, and found it "did not have a significant impact." There is also the real possibility of reducing classes using an alternative schedule (see below) which do not follow the standard block schedule; many of these are additional two-day-a-week offerings.
- c. If we free up one afternoon a week from 50 minute MWF classes, we feel that there will be greater opportunities for seminars, speakers, student internships, and necessary meetings. This will enhance the vitality of the student and faculty experience.
- d. It might be possible to create a "Flex Schedule" in which a faculty member could start a class at 1:10 on a Monday, with the option of running a three-day-a-week 50 minute class, or a two day a week 1 ¼ hour class. In fact, this is a model presented by Infosilem in its report (see "Schedule Analysis and Simulation (V 2)," pp. 48-49). The Queen's University example is presented as a more efficient way to utilize space.

Therefore we are recommending that the university conduct an impact study with the goal of adding more two day a week sessions to the standard schedule.

Below is the analysis we conducted.

#### **1. Other schools.**

A graduate student was assigned to examine a sample of other schools' classroom schedules. Appendix A reports the results. While not an extensive survey, the results are suggestive. It is not unusual to have M/W classes in addition to Tu/Th classes. Interestingly, it is not unusual to have M/W classes within the University of Maine system.

#### **2. Faculty comments.**

We asked for faculty input. The complete set of comments is contained in Appendix B. A summary follows:

There is overwhelming support, albeit not quite unanimous.

Reasonable arguments are presented, including 1 ¼ hour slots being more effective for teaching, MWF afternoon classes are being avoided anyway, it opens up time for faculty /committee meetings (and we would add for student internships, guest speakers, seminars).

A desire was expressed not to convert all MWF to MW.

A concern was expressed to make sure sufficient classrooms are available. [This does not seem to be an issue.]

There was a suggestion for an alternative schedule: for example a M/Th, T/F schedule. In this case the open day would be Wednesday. [Our recommendation does not specify the days.]

A desire was expressed that labs and other once-a-week classes still be allowed on Fridays.

There is some support within the Academic Affairs Committee for changing to MW classes all day. If we divide MWF into slots like Tu/Th (8:00 to 9:15, 9:30 to 10:45, etc.) faculty could still schedule 50 minute MWF classes in those slots.

#### **3. Student feedback.**

We asked the President of Student Government, Kimberly Dao, to conduct a student survey. She advertised the survey in FirstClass, in Senate, and on Facebook. A sample of 388 responded, with 69% of students in support.

#### **4. Current classroom use.**

We requested information from Student Records about the distribution of classes. This information is available on request. We received information on classes for Fall 2011 and Spring 2012. Some points are:

- a. In Fall 2011 there were 708 classes offered on MWF or Tu/Th. (We are ignoring, for the time being, classes that use an alternative schedule not on the standard scheduling template.). Of those 708, only 20 were offered at 2:10 or later on MWF, and only 69 at 1:10 or later. Afternoon MWF classes are relatively unpopular slots. One would think that moving to a M/W 1 ¼ hour option would increase the usage at these times, so this may reduce the overcrowding at peak popularity times.

Let's put these into percentages and compare to Tu/Th.

Normal MWF classes starting at 2 or later represent only 1.1% of all fall classes. MWF starting at 1 or later represent only 3.7% of all fall classes.

Meanwhile, normal Tu/Th classes starting at 2 or later represent 4.3% of all fall classes, 12:30 and on represent 8.5% of all fall classes.

Afternoon classes (in normal scheduling slots) are not as popular as morning classes, but MWF are much less popular than T/Th classes.

b. Classes using an alternative schedule (which do not fit the standard schedule template) suggest there is already a lot of ad hoc M/W classes being created. On MW we counted 48 classes lasting 1 ¼ hours or more as of 1:15 PM or later (and before 5 PM). (Note that there are 1127 classes utilizing an alternative schedule, which might be telling us something; we are not quite sure what without further research. We expect many are labs and other once-a-week classes like Grad classes.)

c. Spring 2012 tells a similar story. Of 654 total classes on MWF or T/TH, only 19 were offered at 2:20 or later on MWF, and only 52 at 1:10 or later. 2:10 and on are very unpopular. Classes utilizing an alternative schedule (i.e., off the grid) in spring totaled 1017.

#### [Appendix Graphic](#)

This unequal distribution of classes can also be seen from the following table produced by Infosilem.

What can we conclude from examining class offering?

i. T/Th is more popular than MWF in general, most likely due to the preference for the 1 ¼ hour classes twice a week (and also an avoidance of Friday afternoons).

ii. Because so relatively few classes are offered on MWF afternoons, a change to 1 ¼ hour slots (on MW or some other grouping (M/F, W/F)) should not be difficult to do. Even if we started at noon.

iii. Making some sort of change like we are considering may help reduce scheduling bottlenecks. It might also reduce classes utilizing an alternative schedule, but only slightly.

#### **5. Scheduling simulation:**

We requested that Enrollment Management include a simulation of a change to a MW afternoon schedule from a MWF schedule when examining classroom scheduling software. Infosilem did this, and concluded that such a change “did not have a significant impact.”

#### Appendix A of Motion 1

#### Class Schedules at Other Schools

#### [Appendix A of Motion 1](#)

#### Appendix B of Motion 1

#### **Faculty Comments on Possible M/W Class Slots like T/Th.**

For Chem. and Bio. Eng, this would not really matter. The classes that work for two days a week, we already can fit on Tues. Thur.

\*\*\*

Yes, this would work well for all the creative writing classes that I teach.

English

\*\*\*

YES!! I'm very interested in the scheduling possibility. I've taught several times in the M/W late afternoon slot and found it very workable for my schedule and the students'. The slightly longer class period is also more effective for most of the courses I teach than the M/W/F 50-minute period.

\*\*\*

I support this...

Department of Wildlife Ecology, University of Maine

\*\*\*

I would very much support offering MW classes, though not perhaps entirely replacing the MWF option.

As chair I often struggled to create a balanced schedule with both TTh and MWF offerings because so many of my colleagues felt strongly that the 75 minute TTh class periods allowed for more effective teaching.

Also, few people want to teach or to take a class that meets after 2:00 on Fridays, so this leaves a lot of rooms unused after 2:00 MW as well.

A move of this sort might make it possible to reserve Fridays for faculty & committee meetings.

Some people do like the shorter class periods. 50 minutes is also better for our new TAs. Rather than going entirely to MW, we might run MWF classes up until 2:00 and then offer two MW slots at 2-3:15 and 3:30-4:45.

Thanks,

English

\*\*\*

I like the MW idea. Since I, personally, have trouble fitting everything into a 50 minute session, I always prefer to teach TTH. In any event, the 50-minute session has always reminded me of the psychoanalytic "hour."

English

\*\*\*

Rick-

Just to have it on the record, I would be a staunch proponent of this type of schedule!

Business

\*\*\*

Are you kidding? Yes, helpful, by all means!!!

Business

\*\*\*

Rick & Judy,

I currently teach ENG 317 on the Monday-Wednesday 75-minute schedule, and I would be very supportive of having more courses adhere to this schedule.

I think the students find it favorable as well.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide input.

English

\*\*\*

It sounds like a nice idea and would probably appeal to both students and faculty.

Business

\*\*\*

Dear Judy and Richard,

I got reply from three SMS faculty.

One was very supportive.

The others were not against but wanted to make sure simulations of such scenarios take place making sure sufficient classrooms are available for all the different needs.

Best

SMS

\*\*\*

Dear Judy and Rick — I strongly support longer classes on MW instead of 50 minute classes on MWF. I teach literature and I find that 50 minutes is rarely long enough for a productive class. My classes include lecture, discussion, and group work.

I find 50 minutes totally inadequate for my pedagogical methods. Thank you for working on this important issue. Best

English Department

\*\*\*

Dear Judy and Rick,

I favor 75-minute classes for most classes. Two-day teaching schedules also ease the time burden on adjunct faculty members. Some first-year students may do better with three 50-minute classes per week.

Not to complicate matters, but I favor a MTh, TF schedule. I think the extra day between classes would help distribute course work over the week, and it would leave a day open in the middle of the week for our proliferating meetings. A MTh/TF schedule would also enable both students and faculty members to arrange three-day weekends for personal and professional use.

\*\*\*

I am very much for this.

Thanks,

Business

\*\*\*

Hi David,

I hope you are doing well! Thanks for soliciting input from us regarding the potential change in teaching schedules. In theory, I'm in favor of changing the M,W,F class schedule so that classes don't meet on Fridays. Most of the horticulture classes meet on M,W instead of M,W,F already. For example, PSE221, Woody Plant Identification meets on M,W from 10-12 to avoid Friday classes. I actually changed my greenhouse management M,W,F class time to T,H because attendance on Fridays was so poor. I do hope that it would still be okay to have labs or classes on Friday. It seems that it would be difficult for students to schedule classes without conflicts if nothing at all happened on Fridays. We also have at least one class that only happens on Friday afternoons (PSE325, Turfgrass Management). It is offered in a solid four hour block of time on Friday afternoons because a member of the turf industry teaches that class as an adjunct. He drives from southern Maine to Orono every day he teaches that class just to teach the class and would not be able to be away from his business easily on other days of the week. I imagine that is a pretty unusual situation, though.

Best,

Horticulture

\*\*\*

Rick,

I am in total agreement with the move to go to MW and T TH Classes. So much so, that about a year ago, I did a little research on other Maine System schools- (although focused on the business programs) and found that we are indeed an anomaly. I have attached some of what I have found- and if you think it useful, I would be happy to gather a bit more. Honestly I went into the project with the mindset that if we have to compete with the system schools (which oddly we do) we need to offer what they offer. As such, my focus was offering of core business classes; what I found was not surprising- all business core classes were mainly offered in a 2 day a week format, but absolutely all (YES ALL) core classes were at least offered in either a 1 day a week or a 2 day a week format- It broadens the accessibility of our program immensely. As it is there are several classes that are in the core and only taught M-W-F morning from 9-10 or some other time in the day. If someone is working- this is an obstacle. Given that in the business program, we want to attract people with some work experience, this is a particularly unique challenge for us. One of my suggestions to Stephanie was to try and get scheduling to give us 2 classes on the bottom floor and we could schedule MW or TTH classes, and maybe 3 hour classes on Friday.

Ok so off my soap box I will go!

Thanks for listening.

Business

\*\*\*

Judy & Rick,

I sent the below request out to the faculty members in the EET dept. I received 3 responses: 2 in favor of 1.25hr M/W classes, and 1 opposed.

EET

\*\*\*

Rick and Judy, I posed your specific question regarding whether the M/W afternoon schedule change to 1 and 1/4 hours would be helpful to or desired by our unit. At today's Anthropology Department meeting it was unanimous that the schedule change would be helpful and should be pursued. A point of discussion was that 2 1/2 hour seminar courses are currently scheduled for Wednesday. It is my impression that changing time slots to 1 1/4 on Monday and Wednesday would increase the flexibility of seminars because the seminar would overlap with two classes rather than three, as well as opening up Friday afternoon. Is that correct?

Anthropology

**Recommendation on Classroom Scheduling, to Jeffrey Hecker, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost, and Jimmy Jung, Vice President for Enrollment Management**

The Faculty Senate urges the university to conduct any further impact studies necessary with the goal of adding more two-day-a-week 1 1/4 hours afternoon sessions to the standard schedule (that is, 1 1/4 hour classes on Monday and Wednesday, Monday and Friday, or Wednesday and Friday). This likely would apply to classes beginning at 1 PM or later. Such a change does not limit the ability of units to schedule classes in alternative formats for pedagogical reasons. In fact, it may be possible to create a "Flex Schedule" in which a faculty member, for example, could start a class at 1:10 on a Monday, with the option of running a three-day-a-week 50 minute class, or a two day a week 1 1/4 hour class (this was the model run by Infosilem, a provider of scheduling software contracted by the University, in its simulations because some disciplines were restricted to MWF schedules for the simulation).

As you can see by the analysis following, faculty support this change, students support this change, and it is a common schedule across the country and especially in the University of Maine system. Furthermore, the Academic Affairs Committee believes the implementation of such a flexible schedule on Monday/Wednesday/Friday afternoons would more efficiently use classroom resources. Currently, classroom resources on M/W/F afternoons are underutilized (see "current Classroom Use" below). At current enrollment levels, simulations run by Infosilem indicate the change would have no significant impact. As enrollments increase, the committee feels that this change, because it would allow for more uniform distribution of classes across all block schedule time periods, would likely be beneficial. Infosilem has indicated in its report that the University has excess room capacity. However, a few campus classrooms have utilization rates close to 80% and analysis would have to determine if they are utilized heavily MWF afternoons.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation above that the University investigate the possibility of adding more two-day-a-week scheduling options as supported by faculty and students. We request that a response be submitted to the Faculty Senate at the first full Faculty Senate meeting of Fall semester, 2014.

## **Motion Approved**

## **MOTION 2**

### **Motion on a Conflict of Interest Policy Concerning Use of Faculty Authored Instructional Materials**

Submitted by Academic Affairs Committee

**Background: The proposed policy is as follows.**

#### **Conflict of Interest Policy Concerning Use of Faculty Authored Instructional Materials**

Background and Purpose: The University of Maine recognizes the value of the scholarship produced by faculty and seeks to encourage their continuing contributions across all disciplines.

Textbooks and other instructional materials (e.g., lab manuals, collections of readings) should be assigned based largely on their academic and pedagogical value. Every instructor is responsible for selecting the most suitable textbook(s) and other instructional materials for his or her course. The University recognizes that there may be no single, obvious choice of textbook(s) or instructional

materials, and that factors such as availability and price may influence an instructor's selection(s)

provided that pedagogical value receives primary consideration.

The purpose of this University policy and procedure is to describe the circumstances under which instructional materials authored or developed by UMaine faculty members and intended for

purchase by students in courses they teach as part of the UMaine curriculum and on which they may

or may not receive a monetary benefit may be used, and the procedure for obtaining prior approval

to assign such instructional materials. This policy ensures that the University is responsive to actual

or perceived instances of a conflict of interest, reaffirms the University's commitment to our students, and is consistent with measures taken at institutions of higher education to ensure that ethical standards are observed. When materials authored by faculty is given or loaned to students or otherwise made freely available (e.g., placed on library reserve, or available without fee elsewhere), this policy does not apply.

Policy Statement: The principle of academic freedom allows faculty members to select their own instructional materials. Faculty members are expected to assign course materials that best meet the instructional goals of their courses. Faculty members may conclude that what they themselves have authored will best help students achieve the courses' learning outcomes. The faculty member may or may not realize a monetary benefit from the assignment of such materials, but in all cases an actual or perceived conflict of interest exists. In cases where such instructional material is assigned to students and intended to be purchased, this policy applies and instructors must obtain prior approval.

Although collections of course notes or Powerpoint slides are not normally expected to be reviewed under this policy, this policy does apply if the faculty member receives any monetary benefit from the sale of these items.

Procedure: When a faculty member wishes to assign instructional materials for purchase by students that the faculty member authored or developed in courses she or he teaches as part of the UMaine curriculum on which she or he may or may not receive any monetary benefit, that faculty member shall complete and submit the attached form to the unit's Peer Committee at least 6 weeks before the end of the semester prior to when the material will be used. When reviewing the faculty member's request, the Peer Committee shall consider the following criteria:

1. How the instructional materials are recognized and used by others in the field;
2. How the instructional materials offer a unique perspective on the topic of study;
3. How the faculty member will disclose to the students to whom they assign the instructional materials the actual or perceived conflict of interest.

The Peer Committee shall evaluate the faculty member's proposed instructional materials against the above criteria and communicate their decision to the department chair, school director or similar (hereafter "unit director") no later than four weeks before the end of the semester prior to when the material will be used. Peer committees may approve a selection of materials for use over multiple

semesters. After three years from the initial approval, a re-review by the peer committee is required.

After receiving the decision of the peer committee, the unit director will review the application to be sure all procedures were followed and, if the unit director concurs, approve the request. If

necessary, the unit director may ask the Peer Committee for further information. The faculty member shall be informed of the decision of the Peer Committee and the decision of the unit director.

If the unit director disagrees with the Peer Committee decision, or the faculty member wishes to appeal the decision, the appeal will be forwarded to a three person committee. The committee will be composed of one faculty member chosen by the faculty member seeking the approval, the faculty chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate, and a Provost designee.

After receiving approval to assign the instructional materials for purchase by students, the faculty member shall inform students during or before the first class in a manner consistent with item 3, above, that she or he may or may not realize monetary benefit from assigning the instructional materials.

*UNIVERSITY OF MAINE*

Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost

*POLICIES AND PROCEDURES,*

*Approved by the Faculty Senate and the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost, date.*

*This policy will be added to the University of Maine Faculty Handbook and posted to the Academic Affairs website.*

### **Policy Concerning Use of Faculty-Authored Materials**

#### **Request Form**

Date:

Name of faculty member:

Department:

Name of text or other material to be assigned:

Name of course:

Expected number of students enrolled:

Semester(s) for which authorization is sought:

Please respond to the following questions:

1. Are the instructional materials recognized and used by others in the field? If yes, please explain including examples.
2. Do the instructional materials offer a unique perspective on the topic of study? If yes, please explain.
3. How will you disclose to the students to whom you wish to assign the instructional materials the actual or perceived conflict of interest?

Date of Peer Committee review:

Approved:    Yes    No

Signed:

Date of Department Chair review:

Approved:    Yes    No

Signed:

### **Appendix to Motion 2**

On Professors Assigning Their Own Texts to Students

The following statement was approved for publication by the Association's Committee on Professional Ethics in November 2004. Comments are welcome and should be addressed to the Association's Washington office.

Professors have long assigned to their students works of which they were the author. The practice ranges from assigning commercially published textbooks they have written to having students buy a volume they have written and published or course packs made up of their own materials they have photocopied. Not only individual professors, but also academic departments and programs, sometimes prepare instructional materials, such as laboratory manuals, that are sold to students. Some professors place their works on electronic reserve, making them freely available to students.

None of these practices is by itself cause for concern. The right of individual professors to select their own instructional materials, a right protected under principles of academic freedom, should be limited only by such considerations as quality, cost, availability, and the need for coordination with other instructors or courses. Professors should assign readings that best meet the instructional goals of their courses, and they may well conclude that what they themselves have written on a subject best realizes that purpose. In some cases, indeed, students enroll in courses because of what they know about the professor from his or her writings, and because they hope to engage in discussion with the professor about those writings in the classroom. Because professors are encouraged to publish the results of their research, they should certainly be free to require their own students to read what they have written.

At the same time, however, students in a classroom can be a captive audience if they must purchase an assigned text that is not available either on library reserve or on a restricted website. Because professors sometimes realize profits from sales to their students (although, more often than not, the profits are trivial or nonexistent), professors may seem to be inappropriately enriching themselves at the expense of their students. To guard against this possibility, some colleges and universities have adopted policies meant to regulate the assignment of a professor's own works.<sup>1</sup>

At Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, materials written by faculty members and intended for purchase by students may not be assigned unless their use is first approved by the appropriate departmental, collegiate, and university-level committees. Faculty members at the University of Minnesota cannot "personally profit from the assignment of materials" to students without authorization of the department chair. At Southern Utah University, a department chair and dean must approve the assignment of faculty-authored materials. Approval by a faculty committee is required at Cleveland State University. Faculty at North Dakota State University and the University of North Texas can assign their own works but are cautioned against retaining profits earned from sales to their students unless, as the North Dakota policy states, "the text has become independently accepted in the field."

A variant of these policies requires professors to choose between contributing to a scholarship or library fund whatever profits are realized from the sale of materials to their own students, or having the materials reviewed by a department committee or chair. Another variant, perhaps unique, is the policy of the Department of Neurology at Case Western Reserve University. Students in the residency program are given faculty-authored textbooks free of charge.

Learned societies and professional organizations have likewise adopted policies to prevent professors from taking advantage of their students. The American Political Science Association, in its code of professional ethics, states that "teachers have an ethical obligation to choose materials for student use without respect to personal or collective gain." The American Sociological Association takes the same position: "sociologists make decisions concerning textbooks, course content, course requirements, and grading solely on the basis of educational criteria without regard to financial or other incentives." The AAUP, in its Statement on Professional Ethics, has also addressed this matter, albeit indirectly. The statement calls upon faculty members to "avoid any exploitation" of students, from which it follows that professors should not take advantage of students by the authority inherent in the instructional role.<sup>2</sup>

None of these policies bars faculty members from assigning their own works to students. Rather, the policies seek to ensure that course-assignment decisions are not compromised by even the appearance of impropriety. In the implementation of these policies, however, it is equally necessary to ensure that procedures followed by colleges and universities to protect students do not impair the freedom of faculty members or their flexibility of choice in deciding what materials to assign their students. Professors, individually and collectively, have the primary responsibility for the teaching done at their institutions. Accordingly, their voice on matters having to do with the selection of course materials should be determinative.

Endnotes:

1. State conflict-of-interest laws that bar state employees from acting officially on matters in which they have a financial stake may also be relevant for professors at state institutions. Back to text

2. Policy and Documents and Reports, 9th ed. (Washington, D.C.: AAUP, 2001), 133-34. Back to text  
(posted 1/05)

Report Category: Standing Committee and Subcommittee Reports Professional Ethics

Tags: Committee on Professional Ethic

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate approves the Conflict of Interest Policy Concerning Use of Faculty

Authored Instructional Materials as follows.

**Motion Approved**



### **Motion 3 to Accept Faculty Handbook Sections 2.5 through 3.8**

Submitted by Academic Affairs Committee

**Background:** The proposed new language of these sections is as follows:

#### **2.5 Student Evaluation of the Faculty**

All instructors, regardless of professorial rank and full- or part-time status, are evaluated for each course taught. While student evaluations are not the sole basis for administrative decisions regarding faculty teaching, they do provide comments to the instructor for self-improvement, allow student opinions to be voiced, and provide data for use in making personnel and course assignment decisions.

Evaluations are generally held in the two-week period prior to the end of classes. The instructor must not be present during the completion of forms or their collection. The instructor may explain the evaluation forms to students before the evaluation. A student or university employee collects the forms, which are then placed in an envelope in view of the class. He or she returns them to the administrative office designated for processing. Some professors or departments are now using online evaluations. As with written paper evaluations, student anonymity must be protected. Results from the evaluations are available to the instructor only after final course grades are issued.

Although most units use a common evaluation instrument which allows comparisons across courses, there is no requirement to use any specific evaluation instrument. In addition, a professor or unit may add questions if desired. Two types of Course Evaluation forms (long or “traditional” and short or “new”) are available from the Faculty Development Center (<http://www.umaine.edu/it/fdc/pages/scoring.php>).

At any time during the semester, faculty members may conduct evaluations of their teaching for their own information. They may use their own forms and procedures for these evaluations.

#### **2.6 Faculty Review of Administrators**

The principles of shared governance at The University of Maine are spelled out in the “University of Maine Shared Governance Policy” agreed to by The Faculty Senate and administration April 19, 2009, available at <https://umaine.edu/facultysenate/wp-content/uploads/sites/218/2010/12/SharedGovernanceUMaine.pdf>.

See Section II. Shared Governance Process and Implementation, subparts “A. Faculty Representation in Decision Making” and “E.b Academic Personnel Decisions: Evaluation.”

Currently, there is no mechanism for joint Faculty Senate and administration evaluation of Department Chairs or unit Directors. For the evaluation of chairs and directors, each college will determine the process which will include significant faculty input, both from inside and outside the department.

The process for reviews for reappointment of deans and directors reporting to the Provost is explained in the “4th Year Evaluation Procedure for Deans/Directors” available from the Provost office. These deans and directors are reviewed early in the last year of the individual’s current appointment. A Dean or Associate Provost, selected by the Provost, will chair the committee. Three faculty member will serve on the committee, two from within the college of the individual being reviewed and one from outside the college, chosen from a list of names provided by the faculty senate (six faculty members within the college and three from outside the college). Faculty representative shall comprise at least half of each evaluation committee. The Provost will select other committee members: a department chair to serve on the committee, and one or more people outside the unit to serve on the committee. Names can be requested through the PEAC and/or the CEAC. Among the information gathered will be the results of a questionnaire sent to faculty/staff/stakeholders of the college/unit.

The process and timing of reviewing the President is specified in the University of Maine System Policy Manual, section 204.1 President – Evaluation Process, available at

<http://www.maine.edu/about-the-system/board-of-trustees/policy-manual/section204-1/>

A Comprehensive Review is scheduled for the third year of service and every four years thereafter. The faculty role in that evaluation is described: “Interviews with, or other means of obtaining feedback from, all Board members, representatives of faculty, students and staff, Board of Visitors, and any other parties selected by the reviewer and Chancellor.”

The university President conducts annual reviews of those reporting directly to that office. At present, faculty have no formal role other than by participation through annual reports of the Cabinet and direct reports. All input is welcomed. Each year, the President conducts an annual performance evaluation of each member of the President’s Cabinet (Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, Senior Advisor to the President, Vice President for Student Life, Vice President for Development, and Director of Athletics). The Executive Vice President and Provost, in consultation with the President, evaluates the Vice President for Research, Vice President for Enrollment Management, and Vice President for Innovation and Economic Development due to their direct report to the Provost. The Senior Vice President for Administration, in consultation with the President, evaluates the Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Administration. The President also evaluates the Director of Equal Opportunity as a Direct Report.

The Annual Performance Evaluation consists of review and discussion of the divisional annual report completed by the Administrator addressing the following major emphases: (1) Executive Summary of Major Goals Accomplished in the Division in Relation to the Major Presidential Goals and Objectives and the Blue Sky Project, (2) Identification of Major Challenges in Meeting Goals; Status of Unmet Goals, (3) Noteworthy Divisional Points of Pride, (4) Noteworthy Efforts to Increase Revenue, Decrease Expenditures, and Increase Fiscal Efficiency, and (5) Desired/Planned Professional Development Opportunities for the Administrator and Divisional Staff, as appropriate.

The Annual Performance Evaluation prepared by the President is then reviewed personally with the Administrator in order to set consensus based goals for the upcoming year affirming success and/or addressing challenges and improvements. The Annual Performance Evaluation is filed with the Office of Human Resources.

## **Chapter 3**

### **3.1 Course/Instruction Procedures and Guidelines**

Faculty members have sole discretion on classroom pedagogy. Faculty members are scholars, skilled communicators, educators, and mentors. Techniques for teaching vary with subject matter, class size, and academic level of the students enrolled. Faculty members adopt the best teaching method for the course and subject matter they teach. Course content in all cases should reflect the catalog description.

#### **3.1.1 Course Modifications and New Courses**

New course proposals and course modifications follow a similar path.

For Undergraduate courses: Forms for both new course proposals and course modifications can be found at the Undergraduate Programs Curriculum Committee (UPCC) website. <http://umaine.edu/upcc/forms/>.

Normally a course is proposed or changed by a unit curriculum committee. The course proposal/change form then goes to the college curriculum committee for approval, to the college dean, and then to UPCC. Once approved by UPCC, the form is signed by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and submitted to the Office of Student Records.

For Graduate courses: The form for both new course proposals and modifications, as well as instructions, can be found at <http://www.umaine.edu/graduate/system/files/files/proposal.pdf>.

1. The College forwards the approved course forms to the Graduate School.
2. All new courses and courses with extensive modifications are presented before the Graduate School Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC) by the course instructor.
3. Once courses are reviewed/approved by the Graduate Curriculum Committee, courses are submitted before the Graduate Board for final review. Once approved by the Graduate Board, they are signed by the Associate Provost and Dean of the Graduate School and submitted to the Office of Student Records.

*Experimental courses:* Both undergraduate and graduate new courses may be submitted once as experimental courses, bypassing the UPCC or the Graduate Curriculum Committee. They are approved by the Provost or the Graduate Dean directly. If such a course becomes a permanent offering, it must be resubmitted through the normal approval process.

#### **3.1.2 Faculty Office Hours**

Each faculty member should schedule times when he or she will be available to consult with students. The course syllabus normally lists office hours and faculty post hours on their office doors. In addition, some faculty will schedule appointments at other times with students, as well as confer by phone or email. Faculty who teach online classes normally set up chat room, Skype, or email arrangements and, for students on campus, may have live office hours.

#### **3.1.3 Inclement Weather Policy**

The university's policy on class cancellations attributable to inclement weather can be found at:

<http://umaine.edu/weatherpolicy/>

#### **3.1.4 Advising Students**

*Academic advising.* As part of their regularly assigned duties, faculty members act as academic advisors. The number of students per advisor is variable. A major part of advising is discussing course choices with students and checking progress toward a degree. Ultimately, however, each student is responsible for satisfying degree requirements. Advisors also commonly discuss future career and education paths with students.

If a student requires further personal, academic, or career counseling, the advisor may suggest contacting the Counseling Center (phone 581-1392, online at <http://umaine.edu/counseling/>) and/or the Career Planning and Placement Office (phone 581-1359, online at <http://umaine.edu/career/>). The Counseling Center provides counseling to students experiencing stress, problems in balancing new and old relationships, or problems with balancing family and school. The Career Planning and Placement Office offers career development counseling and help in finding a job.

*Thesis and Dissertation Guidance.* The Graduate School publishes "Guidelines for Thesis/Dissertation/Project Preparation" containing the rules and regulations for the format(s) required for the thesis or dissertation. The manual is available online at <http://www.umaine.edu/graduate/system/files/files/Thesisguidelines.pdf>. The Graduate School also conducts workshop sessions each fall/spring on thesis and dissertation preparation. The dates for presenting the thesis and holding the oral examination are available from the Graduate School. It is the responsibility of the student to ascertain appropriate due dates. Graduate School information is available online at <http://www.umaine.edu/graduate/>.

#### **3.1.5 Course Syllabi**

A printed or online syllabus is an outline of course content, goals and objectives, basic information about the instructor's procedures and policies, and selected University information.

The content of syllabi varies. Departments may establish specific guidelines for the syllabi. The syllabus provides information to assist in student/instructor communication and provides guidelines for successful class performance. It presents a planned course administration, assisting both students and instructor in organization and time management, distribution of work load, etc. It also provides relevant information that university units or outside agencies review.

Please remember that your syllabus is your contract with the students who take your class. As such, it spells out your expectations of their work and clearly articulates the requirements for your course.

The Undergraduate Program Curriculum Committee (UPCC) provides a syllabus template that faculty may choose to use when developing or modifying a syllabus:

<http://umaine.edu/upcc/forms/syllabus-templaterevised2-131-2/>

Topics Often Covered in the Syllabus:

- 1) A Heading including the course name and number, the academic unit, and the semester/year;
- 2) A Course Description, including Course Goals or Objectives. Full-sentence student learning outcomes are a required component of all new or modified course syllabi submitted for UPCC review. Explanation of method and theory may be added. [It is useful to include the general education requirements satisfied by the course.]
- 3) Tentative schedule for course. Additional information may be posted on line throughout the semester.
- 4) Required and suggested textbooks.
- 5) Instructor information: office hours, e-mail address, telephone number. Instructors may indicate a preferred method of contact (e.g., FirstClass, home telephone).
- 6) Assessment methods. Type and number of exams, quizzes and projects may be listed. Format of exams or assessment, equipment, and make-up policy should be included. If examinations are held outside of usual class meeting times, the dates, place, and times may be provided.
- 7) Grading Policy and Grading Scale. The percentage of the final grade allocated to lab, homework, attendance, final projects, and examinations is stated. A list of criteria for evaluating projects, portfolios, or oral presentations may be provided.
- 8) Policies on cheating and plagiarism. (Defined in the pamphlet "Academic Honesty and Dishonesty."  
<http://www.umaine.edu/deansofstudents/honesty.htm>)
- 9) Homework: when homework is due, format, general grading procedures.
- 10) Attendance. Attendance policy, and any penalty for tardiness or missed classes should be indicated. [See following section on attendance.]
- 11) Labs. Information on the conduct and length of laboratory time is provided.
- 12) Special Instructions. Information regarding disabilities, special needs, prerequisites, field trips, special equipment requirements, etc. are listed.
- 13) Safety and Evacuation Plans. Certain courses may require covering safety aspects including evacuation procedures in an emergency on the syllabus.

The Graduate School follows the same general format for the syllabus as UPCC. Specific guidance for the development of graduate syllabi may be obtained from the Graduate School office (581-3217).

**There are three policy statements required for every syllabus at the University of Maine:**

- 1) Academic Honesty Statement:** Academic honesty is very important. It is dishonest to cheat on exams, to copy term papers, to submit papers written by another person, to fake experimental results, or to copy or reword parts of books or articles into your own papers without appropriately citing the source. Students committing or aiding in any of these violations may be given failing grades for an assignment or for an entire course, at the discretion of the instructor. In addition to any academic action taken by an instructor, these violations are also subject to action under the University of Maine Student Conduct Code. The maximum possible sanction under the student conduct code is dismissal from the University.
- 2) Students with disabilities statement:** If you have a disability for which you may be requesting an accommodation, please contact Ann Smith, Director of Disabilities Services, 121 East Annex, 581-2319, as early as possible in the term.
- 3) Course Schedule Disclaimer (Disruption Clause):** In the event of an extended disruption of normal classroom activities, the format for this course may be modified to enable its completion within its programmed time frame. In that event, you will be provided an addendum to the syllabus that will supersede this version.

### 3.1.6 Distribution of the Syllabus

Syllabi should be provided to every student in the course. Department or unit procedures often require copies in the department or unit offices (or available online). Syllabi are provided to students before or during the first class periods. Alternatively or in addition, syllabi may be posted online

for student access.

### 3.2 Class Periods

Usually, class periods are equivalent to 150 minutes per week per semester for a three-credit course. Classes may be divided into three 50-minute periods, two 75-minute periods, a single meeting once a week, or some other format. Laboratories range from one to four periods (e.g., equivalent to one to four 50 minute periods), depending upon the course.

#### 3.2.1 Class Roster

Official class rosters are provided on MaineStreet. The presence of a student's name on the roster as "enrolled" indicates registration for the course (inclusive of students auditing the course) and authorization for that student to attend class. Additions and deletions to the list occur during the add-and-drop period. Students who have dropped will appear on MaineStreet as "dropped." If a student's name does not appear on the MaineStreet class roster, faculty should alert the office of Student Records.

#### 3.2.2 Class Attendance

The overall policy of the University is that students are responsible for attending all class meetings for courses for which they are registered. Each instructor determines the specific attendance policy for the course and makes it known to students through the course syllabus and in class during the first week of classes. Instructors may assign a lower letter grade for students' failure to adhere to the attendance policy.

Students sometimes miss classes because of ill health, family emergency, or other reason beyond their control. It is the student's responsibility to notify instructors of the reasons for missing class and to make arrangements for making up missed work. If absences are extensive, even for legitimate reasons, it may be impossible to meet the objectives of the course. In such instances the instructor may assign a grade of Incomplete.

Students may miss class due to authorized on- or off-campus university functions, such as varsity athletics, band, or drama. Faculty should be notified by an appropriate entity (e.g., athletic department, music or theater department) early in the semester.

There is a policy regarding student athletes and missed classes. Athletic schedules should be prepared so that no more than 10% of class sessions in any course will be missed due to participation in athletic events. Last-minute changes may be necessary due to rain-outs and comparable situations. Faculty are responsible for providing reasonable make-up work opportunities for students with bona fide excused absence for athletic participation, per the Faculty Senate resolution passed in May 1995.

### 3.3 Disruptive Behavior

Disruptive behavior may be subject to disciplinary action or intervention. Problems such as excessive tardiness, lack of courtesy, or other behavior inappropriate in the classroom should be discussed with the appropriate dean or director. The Associate Dean of the Graduate School is the contact for all graduate student complaints.

All crisis situations should be immediately reported to the UMaine Police at 581-4040 or 911 and to the Vice President for Student Life and Dean of Students (581-1406). A crisis is any situation in which there is reasonable cause to suspect that there is an imminent risk to the health and safety of a student and/or UMaine community member.

In situations where staff have concerns about a student's behavior and do not believe it constitutes a crisis, or are in doubt about whether it constitutes a crisis, the following offices may be contacted and/or consulted:

UMaine Police	581-4040
Vice President for Student Life	581-1406
Counseling Center	581-1392

Instructors may ask disruptive students to leave their classroom at any time.

The Division of Student Life has developed a Student Behavior Review Team (SBRT), which will review any student situation that involves medical, mental health, or behavioral problems. SBRT is a team of professionals from across the campus and across disciplines that reviews cases and recommends to the Vice President for Student Life timely responses and interventions for student situations where student behavior raises concern. The goal is always to fashion a careful and appropriate outreach or intervention to students who are struggling in or outside the classroom. SBRT is co-chaired by the Director of the Counseling Center and the Assistant Vice President for Student Life.

More information on SBRT can be found at <http://umaine.edu/studentlife/sbirt/>.

If you have a concern about a UMaine student, you can contact the Assistant Vice President for Student Life at 207-581-1406 (weekdays) or at 581-4040 (24/7). Referrals to SBRT also can be made via an online form available at: <http://www.umaine.edu/studentlife/referral/>.

Statements concerning disruptive behavior that a faculty member may choose to put on your syllabus can be found at: <http://umaine.edu/judicialaffairs/resources-for-faculty/>.

### 3.4 Cheating, Plagiarism, and Academic Integrity

While rare, incidents of academic dishonesty, e.g., cheating, academic misconduct, fabrication or plagiarism, do occur at the University of Maine. Should you suspect that there has been such a violation in one of your classes, there are several things that should be kept in mind:

1. All incidents must be reported to the Office of Community Standards (581-1409). This allows the campus to monitor for students who may have been involved in multiple incidents.
2. As a faculty member you have the following options in handling the matter:
  - a. You may handle it exclusively within your classroom jurisdiction. A faculty member, of course, is the only person who may assign a failing or reduced grade as part of a sanction.
  - b. You may refer the case to the appropriate Dean, the Dean of the Graduate School, or the Provost.
  - c. The case may be referred to the Conduct Officer for adjudication under the UMS Student Conduct Code. This procedure affords a greater variety of sanctions than is available to the faculty member, but cannot impact the grade awarded.
  - d. You may do a combination of the above.

Complete details, including sanction guidelines and the "Academic Integrity Violation Report Form," can be found at: <http://umaine.edu/judicialaffairs/resources-for-faculty/>. The Academic Integrity Violation Report Form describes the process in detail including information and materials to provide with the Report Form. The form is submitted to the Office of Community Standards, Rights, and Responsibilities (OCSRR), 315 Memorial Union.

This site also has a link to the Student Honor Code published in the Student Handbook. The violations related to academic dishonesty are listed under section III.

### 3.5 Examinations

Examinations are common and important assessment tools. The terminology used at the University of Maine, types of examinations given, and information on scheduling examinations follows.

**Quiz.** A brief examination designed to occupy only part of a class period and to cover a small fragment of work.

**Prelim or Exam.** An examination designed to occupy an entire class period and to cover a major unit of work.

**Final.** An examination given during the final exam week lasting for two hours or more. The final examination should count for no more than one-third of the course grade, although exceptions may be made by the instructor in consultation with the chairperson of the department in which the course is offered.

No examinations of any kind may be scheduled during the last week of classes, except by permission of the appropriate Associate Dean or Director. A final examination may be scheduled only during final exam week. If a final is not planned, and the instructor wishes to schedule a prelim covering the last weeks of the course, this prelim must be given during final exam week. These rules do not apply to Continuing Education Division courses.

Students who are scheduled for more than three final examinations in one day or have two exams scheduled at the same time may have an examination rescheduled through the Office of Student Records or by conferring with their professors.

The scheduled final exam day and time is listed on MaineStreet.

#### 3.5.1 Types of Examinations

Instructors are free to choose the type of test offered, e.g., essay, true-false, multiple choice. Machine scoring is compatible with true-false and multiple-choice tests. The instructor usually proctors the test. Each department makes its own arrangements for the printing or duplicating of examinations.

#### 3.5.3 Absence from Final Examinations

A student with a legitimate reason (i.e., written or similar documentation for health or extenuating personal circumstances) for missing a regular final examination may arrange with the instructor to make up the exam.

Details on incomplete grades follow in the section "Grades and Grading."

#### 3.5.4 Machine Scoring of Examinations

The Faculty Development Center (149 Memorial Union) provides an optical scanning test scoring service for the faculty. Reports include information such as Frequency Distribution Item Analysis, Test Results by Student, and Student Response Report. Normally, scores are available within 24 hours of receipt of the tests. For more information go to: <http://www.umaine.edu/it/fdc/pages/scoring.php>.

#### 3.5.5 Examination File

Copies of recent final examinations for student use may be placed at the Reserve Desk in Fogler Library. Filing examination questions at the Library is optional for faculty. Fraternity or sorority houses and some dormitories may have their own examination files. Some faculty members may make previous exams available electronically.

### 3.6 Grades and Grading

The faculty have sole responsibility for assigning grades. Grading of college-level courses requires specific disciplinary knowledge that is gained only through advanced study in a discipline and for many fields requires constant updating of specific knowledge. This expertise is the sole domain of the university faculty and cannot be infringed upon without negatively impacting the quality of the education of the students.

### 3.6.1 Approved Grading Symbols and Definitions

Complete information regarding grades and grading can be found in the Undergraduate Catalogue (<http://catalog.umaine.edu/> and choose "Grades and Grading" from the topics on the right).

A condensed version follows:

The University of Maine uses a letter-grade system ranging from A to F. Faculty members have the option of adding + (no A+) and – grades to the basic letter grades, but such fine distinctions may be inappropriate for many courses. Whatever the system used, it is important to understand that there is no University-wide equivalence between percentage grades (such as 80%) and letter grades (such as B). Each instructor makes these determinations according to the grading system described in the course syllabus.

The qualitative value of the five basic letter grades is defined as follows:

- **A**, Superior work.
- **B**, Good work.
- **C**, Satisfactory but undistinguished work.
- **D**, Poor work that does not adequately prepare students for more advanced work in the discipline. While some courses completed with D grades may contribute towards the total credits needed for graduation, others may be unacceptable for certain specific requirements and within the academic major.
- **F**, Failure. No credit is earned for a failed course. If a student has not participated in at least half of the class, then the L grade is appropriate.

The grades A-F have the following numerical values used in calculating a student's Grade Point Average (GPA):

A = 4.00 B = 3.00 C = 2.00 D = 1.00

A- = 3.67 B- = 2.67 C- = 1.67 D- = 0.67

B+ = 3.33 C+ = 2.33 D+ = 1.33 F = 0.00

The University uses a variety of grades on transcripts to designate special circumstances. These include:

- **AU**, assigned only for courses taken under the audit option.
- **DG**, deferred grade. This is used only for courses that extend beyond a single semester.
- **F\***, for a course failed on the pass/fail grading option. No credit is earned and the GPA is not affected.
- **I**, for "Incomplete." This grade means that, in consultation with the student, the instructor has postponed the assignment of a final grade to allow the student to complete specific work not turned in before the end of the semester. Instructors assign the "I" grade only when they are persuaded that events beyond the student's control prevented the completion of assigned work on time and when the student has participated in more than 50% of the class. If the incomplete work is not submitted within the time allotted by the faculty member, the grade will automatically be changed to an "F" grade. Students receiving an "I" grade are not allowed to re-register for the same course until the incomplete has been made up or converted to an "F" grade. A student receiving an "I" grade may not make up missed work by sitting-in on the course the next time it is taught. Refer to the Incomplete Grade and Graduation section below.
- **L**, Failure for lack of participation. This grade indicates that a student participated in less than 50% of the class, but did not formally withdraw from the course. This grade counts the same as an F.
- **LP**, Low Pass, for a course passed on the pass/fail grading option with a D+, D, or D-. Credit is earned, but the grade point average (GPA) is not affected.
- **P**, for a course passed on the pass/fail grading option with a C- or above. Credit is earned, but the grade point average (GPA) is not affected.
- **TH**, final grade deferred. This is used only for the undergraduate thesis.
- **W**, indicating that the student officially withdrew from the course.
- 

### 3.6.2 Graduate School Grading

Normally, only a grade of A or B is acceptable for course work on a student's program of study. A grade of C may carry graduate degree credit if a student's advisory committee so recommends and if the Graduate School approves such an exception. No student, however, will be allowed to accumulate more than six hours of C grades on a program of study for a master's degree, nor more than 12 hours of C grades on a program of study for a Ph.D. or Ed.D. Grades below C are not considered acceptable for any graduate student. More information can be found in the Graduate Catalogue (<http://gradcatalog.umaine.edu/> and select "General Policies" from the list on the left).

### 3.6.3 Submittal of Final Grades

At the end of each semester, Final Grade Rosters must be submitted on MaineStreet five days from the day of the final examination. If final papers or projects are given, Final Grade Rosters are due five days from the last day of finals week. Prompt reporting of grades lets the Committee on Academic Standing make decisions on students' futures and is needed for graduation processing.

Students Not Listed on Roster. If a student is attending the course but his or her name does not appear on the Grade Roster, please send an email message (from your umit.maine.edu or maine.edu account only) to [grading@umit.maine.edu](mailto:grading@umit.maine.edu) and include the student's full name, student ID, course, section, number of credits, and grade. Grades cannot be accepted via telephone.



### 3.6.4 Appealing Grades and Assignments

The University of Maine has formal procedures by which students may appeal the assignment of grades by an instructor, accusations of cheating or plagiarism, or certain aspects of classroom procedure.

Detailed procedures at the undergraduate level can be found at:

<http://umaine.edu/handbook/academics/appealing-grades-and-assignments/>

Procedures for appealing a grade at the graduate level can be found at:

<http://gradcatalog.umaine.edu/content.php?catoid=28&navoid=457>

### 3.6.5 Transfer Grades.

See transfer policy in the Undergraduate Catalogue (<http://catalog.umaine.edu/> and choose "Transfer Credit" from the topics on the right).

### 3.6.6 Study Abroad Credits.

Students are best advised to consult both the Office of International Programs and the Department(s) to which they plan to seek approval for study abroad credits. Approval of a program of study prior to going abroad is essential.

### 3.6.7 FERPA

Advisors and all faculty members should be aware of FERPA (Family and Education Privacy Act), the federal law which prohibits reporting information regarding a student to others. The Associate Dean of the faculty member's College or the Office of Equal Opportunity may also advise on what information concerning a student advisee may or may not be given out. See <http://umaine.edu/handbook/policies-regulations/confidentiality-ferpa/>.

### 3.6.8 Special Reports on Students.

Instructors may report a student in danger of academic failure to the student's academic dean. Reports may be written or verbal. Students in danger of failure may be referred or reported to the Dean of Students, the Student Health Center, the Counseling Center, Police and Safety, the academic advisor, or the student's academic dean.

## 3.7 Academic Achievement Awards

**Full-time Dean's List.** The Dean's List is prepared at the end of each semester. To be eligible for the Full-Time Dean's List, a student must have completed 12 or more calculable credits in the semester and have earned a 3.50 or higher semester GPA.

**Part-time Dean's List.** Students who have part-time status during both the fall and spring semesters of a given academic year are eligible for Part-time Dean's List. They must have completed 12 or more calculable credits over both terms and have earned a combined GPA in those terms of 3.50.

### Presidential Scholar Award

To be eligible for the Presidential Scholar Achievement, a student must be degree-seeking and have completed 12 or more calculable credits in the semester and have earned a 4.0 semester GPA.

## 3.8 Textbooks and Academic Supplies

The Bookstore uses a self-service textbook selection system that allows students to search for books for their courses themselves. It is important to have complete information from each faculty member regarding course textbook needs.

### How to Order Textbooks

Information for ordering from the university bookstore can be found at: <http://www.bookstore.umaine.edu/>

The Bookstore sets target deadline dates for ordering textbooks: Fall and Summer Semesters: before April 30. Spring Semester: before November 1.

When a text is selected for a course, the value of used copies increases dramatically. During finals week buy-back, the Bookstore pays more for books that will be reused on campus the next semester. The goal is to maximize the number of used texts available to students. Early textbook orders allow the Bookstore time to buy books from other campuses through text wholesalers.

Special academic supplies or materials for a course also can be ordered through the Bookstore.

If a requested text is out-of-print, out-of-stock, being replaced by a new edition, or there are any other problems, the faculty member may need time to choose a replacement.

The reserve book desk of Fogler Library may make hard and electronic copies of course materials available. Advance requests are essential.

### Custom Publishing

The Bookstore is the central point for producing customized course materials. Course packets are produced at a reasonable cost. Printing Services also conducts copyright clearances and secures permissions where necessary. Faculty members provide full source information for the documents copied.

### **Desk Copies**

Major publishers require that desk copy requests come from a faculty member and/or the department. The Bookstore maintains an up-to-date listing of publishers, addresses, phone/fax numbers, and names of sales representatives for major publishing companies.

### **Text Returns to Publishers**

Due to increasingly restrictive return policies, unsold texts are returned to publishers after the fifth week of the semester. Students who wait this long to purchase books may find texts unavailable.

### **Academic Supplies**

The Bookstore carries pencils, pens, notebooks, paper, rulers, highlighters, staplers, folders, report covers, special papers, poster board, fine writing instruments and many other specialty items. It also has art, engineering, and forestry supplies, both required and supplemental, for classes. Computers and software are available at the Computer Connection (located in the Bookstore).

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate accepts the above edits to the Faculty Handbook.

### **Motion Approved**

### **Motion 4 to Accept Faculty Handbook Section 3.6.9**

Submitted by Academic Affairs Committee

#### **Background:**

*The existing policy as cited in the 1988 Faculty Handbook is:*

“All grades changed by an instructor should state the reason for the change, and must be approved by the Dean of the College. The only exception to this change is a change from an Incomplete to a letter grade (see section on change of Incomplete grades which follows.)

The purpose of this procedure is to assure that grade changes are clearly justified for academic reasons. A change of grade should be a rarity, made only when legitimate mistakes such as computational errors, cause the initial grade to be incorrect. Change of Grade cards (YELLOW CARDS) are available in the Dean's Office. After the card has all the appropriate signatures, it is forwarded by the Dean's Office to the Registrar's Office.”

*Why change?*

The policy needs to be changed to reflect the move from cards to MaineStreet. Work on this change began over two years ago. The Academic Affairs Committee met with representatives from Student Records and the associate deans. The previous Associate Provost worked with us. We had faculty senate input. The changes were supported by the Provost (at the time) and Associate Provost (at the time).

Two significant changes are:

1. The six month window before a grade change must get approval. That was designed to cover the next semester when grade entry or calculation errors are most likely to be discovered. It was negotiated with and agreed to by the associate deans. After six months any proposed grade change will be reviewed, but a potential denial by a dean or dean's designee can be appealed to a faculty group.
2. Final appeal of a rejection of a change of grade resides with a faculty group. This was a demand of the faculty: grades are a faculty decision.

The policy was approved by all groups last spring, but the actual motion to approve was tabled to support “work to rule.”

In December it was brought forward but was not voted on because the final arbiter was not a group that could do that. That has been changed.

The Provost did not support the policy put forward last December. He has not discussed this policy with the Academic Affairs Committee.

### **Recommendation**

The recommended language for Section 3.6.9 is as follows:

#### **3.6.9 Change of Grade Policy**

Instructors desiring to change a grade after official posting should submit a grade change request to the MaineStreet Grade Roster. Normally, grade changes are a result of clerical errors or errors of omission. Grade changes made beyond six months of the end of a semester require approval from the Dean or designee. If the faculty member wants to appeal the decision of the Dean or Dean's designee, the Provost will convene an ad hoc committee consisting of three full professors, at least one of whom must be from the faculty member's college and one of whom must be from another college. The decision of this review committee shall be final.



When entering the grade change on MaineStreet, the instructor should enter a brief written rationale containing their reasons for wanting to change the grade.

If a student wishes to improve a grade, then the option to repeat the course should be considered. For policy regarding incomplete grades, please see the incomplete grade policy in this catalogue.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate accepts section 3.6.9 as written above as an addition to the Faculty Handbook.

#### **Motion Approved**

### **MOTION 5**

#### **Motions to Eliminate the Master of Public Administration and Bachelor of Arts in Public Management**

Submitted by Program Creation & Reorganization Review Committee (PCRR)

#### **Background:**

Both degrees were part of the former Department of Public Administration. The proposed eliminations resulted from the APPWG process of 2010, with much discussion documented in the PCRR archive of 2010/2011. The Department of Public Administration was closed in June 2012. The two program elimination proposals were submitted to the Faculty Senate on June 13, 2013. Program eliminations were put on hold by the Faculty Senate during contract settlements last semester, and thus delayed. The open meeting for both eliminations was held on April 25, 2014. Dean Ivan Manev of the Maine Business School provided a detailed history of the elimination of the Department of Public Administration and the respective degree programs. There were no comments made against the elimination of the programs.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the PCRR to eliminate the Master of Public Administration (MPA) from the former Department of Public Administration.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the PCRR to eliminate the B.A. in Public Management from the former Department of Public Administration.

#### **Motion Approved**

### **MOTION 6**

#### **Motion to Eliminate the Masters of Music in Conducting from the School of Performing Arts**

Submitted by Program Creation & Reorganization Review Committee (PCRR)

**Background:** The program elimination of the Masters of Music in Conducting was initiated through the APWWG process in 2010. The proposal for program elimination was submitted to the PCRR on February 11, 2013, recommending the elimination of the self-standing graduate degree in Conducting, in favor of sub-plans to be offered within the Masters of Music in Music Education degree. The open meeting for consideration of the proposal was held on April 28, 2014 with four people in attendance. Beth Wiemann, School of Performing Arts, provided a summary and history of the proposal. The alternative to the self-standing graduate degree in Conducting was considered preferable based on anticipated reduction of tenure-track positions due to retirements. Discussion by those present at the open meeting focused on the problem of program loss due to retirement, but without alternative plans to the present proposal for elimination.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the recommendation of the PCRR to eliminate the Masters of Music in Conducting from the School of Performing Arts.

#### **Motion Approved**

### **MOTION 7**

#### **Motion 7 to Accept Faculty Handbook Chapter 6**

Submitted by Financial and Institutional Planning Committee (FIPC)

#### **Chapter 6: Helpful Information and Resources**

##### **6.1 MaineCard**

The MaineCard is the University of Maine identification card. Cards are available in the MaineCard office in basement of the Memorial Union (581-CARD). The office is open from 7:30-4:00 Monday through Friday. Faculty, staff, and full- and part-time students are eligible to use the MaineCard at many areas around campus. It is the only ID card needed on campus. If appropriate fees are paid, the MaineCard serves as a pass to facilities such as Recreational Sports, the Alfond Arena, and the Athletic Ticket Office. The MaineCard is required to check out books from Fogler Library, access many UM online databases, and copy machines in the library take the MaineCard as well. The MaineCard may also be used as a debit card for printing, at dining services and in the bookstore. The card may be "charged" online, at MaineCard Services at 130 Memorial Union or at other campus locations. Further details about the card are available online at [www.umaine.edu/mainecard](http://www.umaine.edu/mainecard).

## 6.2 Parking on Campus

To park on campus, all motor vehicles must display a valid parking permit, valid state registration plate(s), valid state inspection sticker, and be in operable condition.

A fee is charged for parking permits and an application is available online at [www.umaine.edu/parking/](http://www.umaine.edu/parking/). Permits are also available from 7:30-4:00 Monday-Friday at the MaineCard Services (581-2273) located at 130 Memorial Union. Temporary visitor permits valid for one day can be obtained during the weekdays from MaineCard Services in 130 Memorial Union, Bear Necessities in Alford Arena and the Visitor Center in Buchanan Alumni House or at any time at the UMaine Police Department.

A map of parking areas is available online at [www.umaine.edu/locator/](http://www.umaine.edu/locator/). Parking lots are color-coded and may be used only by those holding appropriate parking decals. Vehicles parked in violation of the parking rules are subject to impoundment and towing at the owner's expense with no notification. For assistance after hours and on weekends, call the Public Safety Dispatcher at 581- 4040.

Full details on parking rules on campus are available online at <http://umaine.edu/parking/rules-regulations/>.

## 6.3 Campus Mail

Campus mail is used for internal university communications; no postage is necessary. The University pays non-campus mail postal charges only for mail that is essential to the programs and activities of the institution. Personal mail and private business mail require postage paid by the sender. U.S. postal boxes are conveniently located on campus, and there is a full-service post office in Memorial Union.

United States mail and campus mail are delivered in each campus building once each day. Outgoing University mail is collected in each building daily and is taken to the mailroom in the Public Affairs Building. Official University mail for delivery off campus should have an account number. This mail is processed in the Service Building with the cost assigned to the specific department. Use of the University postage meter for personal or private business mail is strictly prohibited.

Overnight mail services available from the campus include Federal Express and United Parcel Service. The Purchasing Department (581-2695) supplies information on locations, pick up times, and envelopes.

Tampering with campus or U.S. mail should be reported to Public Safety (581-4040), which will contact the Postal Inspectors as appropriate.

## 6.4 Telecommunications

The Telecommunication division of University Services – Information Technologies (IT) offers services ranging from voice telephone to video conferencing. Telecommunication is undergoing a reorganization as responsibilities are shifted from the University of Maine to the University of Maine System.

Telephones are programmed before they are installed and a user's manual is available through the Information Technologies (<http://www.umaine.edu/it/divisions/telecom/>). Changes to existing telephones require a departmental request or an IT work order.

An authorization code, typically obtained by departmental chairs for new faculty, is required to place a long distance phone call. Cellular phones may be purchased or rental through the telecommunication division.

Additional details on telecommunication services and procedures can be obtained by reviewing the Information Technologies web site (<http://www.umaine.edu/it/divisions/telecom/>) or calling 581-1600.

## 6.5 Faculty Pay Schedule

Full-time and part-time regular faculty members receive their salary in twelve equal installments, September through August. Part-time temporary faculty teaching on a contract-per-course basis receive salary in September, October, November, and December for Fall semester courses and January, February, March, April, and May for Spring semester courses. Paychecks are issued on the last business day of the month. Paychecks may be deposited directly into a bank account if arrangements are made with the Payroll Office.

The Payroll Office is part of the Office of Human Resources and is located at 142 Corbett Hall (Phone: 581-1581). Forms including direct deposits, federal and state W-4, and request for summer salary retirement contributions can be obtained from the Office of Human Resources Payroll website (<http://umaine.edu/hr/hr-resources/payroll/>).

## 6.6 Childcare Facilities on Campus

A range of childcare services is available to faculty, staff, and students at the University of Maine. A waiting list is maintained for all programs.

The University of Maine's Children's Center (581-4076) offers full-time licensed childcare for children six weeks through five years old. The Center is open from 7:30-5:30, Monday through Friday, for fifty-one weeks per year. Private fee childcare slots are reserved for University affiliated families . Further information is available online at <http://www.umaine.edu/childrencenter/>.

The Child Study Center (581-3272) follows the University Calender (14 week sessions during fall and spring semesters) and offers three options for half-day preschool programs for children between two-and-a-half and six years of age. It is open from 7:45-5:00 on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and from 7:45-noon on Tuesday and Thursday. Online information is available at <http://umaine.edu/psychology/child-study-center/>.

The Child Development Learning Center (581-3123) offers both nursery school and prekindergarten programs for children between 33 months and five years of age. The Child Development Learning Center follows the University calendar, operating for 14 weeks during the fall and spring

semesters. Online information is available at <http://umaine.edu/edhd/professionals/katherine-m-durst-child-development-learning-center/>.

## **6.7 University Housing**

A limited number of one and two bedroom apartment units for students, faculty, and staff are located in University Park in Old Town, one mile from the University of Maine campus. Pets are not allowed in these units. The University Park Office (581-4854) handles the rentals. There is normally a waiting list for these apartments. Current rates, photographs, and other details are available online at <http://umaine.edu/housing/family-housing/>.

The Commuter and Non-Traditional Student Program (581-1734) maintains a database of house listings, provides a model lease, and legal lists resources for renters. These resources are available at <http://umaine.edu/cntsp/housing/>.

## **6.8 Auditoriums and Performance Spaces**

### **6.8.1 Collins Center for the Arts (Hutchins Concert Hall)**

The Collins Center for the Arts (Hutchins Concert Hall), dedicated in September 1986, with a major front of house renovation in 2007-2008, is the cultural focus of the University of Maine campus and the surrounding region. Hutchins Concert Hall is a multi-use space that seats 1,435 people. As a part of the University of Maine campus in Orono, Hutchins hosts a wide variety of events, presenting classical and contemporary music, dance, theater, comedy, ceremonies, and lectures. The Hutchins Concert Hall has two basic configurations to accommodate the variety of events presented: The theater/dance mode and the orchestral configuration. Complete information about the current performance season, including ticketing, is available online at <http://www.collinscenterforthearts.com/>

Contact information

Collins Center for the Arts  
5746 Collins Center for the Arts  
Orono, ME 04469 Box Office: 207-581-1755  
FAX: 207-581-1837

The Collins Center for the Arts (MCA) also houses the Hudson Museum. Open from 9:00-4:00 Monday through Friday and 11:00-4:00 on Saturday. The Hudson Museum maintains a collection of over 8,000 ethnographic and archaeological objects including a world class assemblage of 2,828 Precolumbian ceramics, lithics and gold work dating from 2000 BC to the time of the Spanish Conquest. This collection is complemented by contemporary ethnographic objects from Mexico, Guatemala and Panama.

The North American collection includes Native American and Native Alaskan objects from the Northwest Coast, Arctic, Plains, Southwest and Northeast. The Maine Native American collection boasts 400 objects, including the largest institutional collection of Penobscot basket making tools in the region. Southwestern holdings include historic Pueblo pottery, Hopi kachinas, Navajo textiles, Pima and Havasupai basketry, Navajo and Zuni silverwork and contemporary art. Arctic holdings feature ethnographic clothing, tools and weapons.

The Museum displays several temporary exhibits each academic year. The Museum offers guided tours for University classes, lectures by distinguished anthropologists and archaeologists, staff assistance with directed research projects, internships, and teaching exhibits. Online information is available at <http://umaine.edu/hudsonmuseum/>

### **6.8.2 Other Auditoriums and Theatres**

Information is available at <https://umaine.edu/spa/facilities/>

### **6.8.3 Minsky Music Recital Hall**

A 276-seat recital hall, Minsky is primarily used by the Music Division for faculty recitals, ensemble performances and student recitals. The Theatre/Dance division uses the space for a fall dance showcase of works in progress and has held staged readings. <https://umaine.edu/thearts/museums-facilities/minsky-recital-hall/>

### **6.8.3 Hauck Auditorium**

The 546-seat Hauck Auditorium is the main location for student plays and dance recitals. It is the main stage for the School of Performing Arts.

### **6.8.4 The Al Cyrus Pavilion Theatre**

An 89-seat 3/4 round theatre. The Pavilion is on the National Registry of Historic Buildings and was renovated from a livestock judging space. Some departmental shows are produced in the Pavilion, but it is mainly used for thesis and other student productions, including the popular Underdog and Upperdog performances.

## **6.9 Museum of Art**

The Museum of Art of the University of Maine is located in Norumbega Hall on Central Street in downtown Bangor. One of the oldest and most distinguished land-grant university collections in the country, permanent holdings include nearly 6,000 works of art. Faculty may request artwork for their offices through the Museum (561-3350). Open Monday through Friday 10am-5pm. Further information on the museum is available online at <http://umma.umaine.edu/>

## **6.10 Recreational Facilities and Athletics**

The University has an extensive number of recreational facilities: the Memorial Gym, Lengyel Gym, New Balance Student Recreation Center, Alford Arena, and the Maine Bound Adventure Center. Recreational facilities are provided for students, faculty, and employees of the University of Maine. Student fees allow them access to recreational facilities. Faculty, employees, and the public may purchase membership passes that entitle them to similar privileges. Spouse and family passes are also available. Passes may be purchased New Balance Student Recreation Center. Online information is available at <https://umaine.edu/campusrecreation/facilities/>

Student intercollegiate athletics at the University of Maine include most major varsity sports, i.e., baseball, basketball, cross country, football, ice hockey, soccer, swimming/diving, and track and field for men and basketball, cross country, field hockey, ice hockey, soccer, softball, swimming/diving, track and field, and volleyball for women. A complete schedule of University student athletics is available online at [www.goblackbears.com/schedule/thisweek/index.html](http://www.goblackbears.com/schedule/thisweek/index.html). Ticket information for University athletic events is also available online at <http://www.goblackbears.com/landing/index> or by calling 581- BEAR.

## **6.11 Reserved**

## **6.12 University Information Technologies**

### **6.12.1 Information Technologies (IT) at the University of Maine**

Information Technologies is undergoing a reorganization as responsibilities shift from the University of Maine to University Services – Information Technologies administered by the University of Maine System. The Computer Connection and the Repair Center are administered by Auxiliary Services at the University of Maine.

The Department of Information Technologies (IT) works closely with faculty, students, and staff to plan and implement facilities to ensure the University's technological infrastructure. At the University of Maine, IT encompasses a variety of functions. Those related to computers include networking services, public clusters, and the Computer Connection, the Help Center, the Faculty Development Center, and the Repair Center. Audio Visual Services, Video Production Technical Services, Training and Education Services, and Telecommunications Services also fall under IT's mission. IT at UMaine provides information on First Class, Antivirus, Blackboard, @umaine.edu, wireless network and Passwords.  
<http://www.umaine.edu/it/>

### **6.12.2 First Class**

FirstClass offers campus-wide Macintosh and Windows point and click interface, personal e-mail, public and private electronic conferencing and discussion groups, Netnews and ListServ subscription services, online chatting with other users, and localized user support and training. Information on FirstClass is available at <http://www.umaine.edu/it/services/descriptions/firstclass-email.php> and <http://www.umaine.edu/it/software/firstclass/>

### **6.12.3 Computer Connection**

The Computer Connection (581-2580) is the campus computer store. Low-cost computer equipment and peripherals are available to the campus community. Computer Connection is located in the bookstore of the Memorial Union. <https://www.umaine.edu/computerconnection/>.

### **6.12.4 Help Center**

The Help Center (581-2506) provides personal, e-mail, and telephone consultation on operating system, network connection, and common software problems for personal computers and peripherals. It also provides limited on-site support for software configuration problems and resources and assistance in use of specialized graphics processing equipment. See <http://www.umaine.edu/it/helpcenter/>

### **6.12.5 Computer Repair Center**

The personal computer and peripherals Repair Center (581-3282) provides bench-based, on-site repair and warranty support services for the campus and the Computer Connection at reasonable prices. Further information is available online at <http://www.umaine.edu/it/divisions/repair/>.

### **6.12.6 Other Information Technologies Services**

The Information Technologies web site <http://www.umaine.edu/it/services/> gives further information on other services the department offers including audiovisual and video services, networking, telecommunications, equipped classrooms, and workshops and seminars.

## **6.13 Fogler Library**

The Raymond H. Fogler Library is the largest library in the state. Library collections are available online at <http://www.library.umaine.edu/>.

### **6.13.1 URSUS**

URSUS is the online catalog ([http://www.library.umaine.edu/default\\_ursus.asp](http://www.library.umaine.edu/default_ursus.asp)) of the University of Maine System libraries and other participating libraries, such as the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library and Bangor Public Library. URSUS contains directories of the majority of print and non-print materials, including books, serials, microforms, sound recordings, maps, government documents, and other audiovisual

formats. Combined collections total over one million bibliographic records and over two million volumes. URSUS provides location and status information and a bibliographic description of each item.

### **6.13.2 Mariner**

Mariner, with URL <http://libraries.maine.edu/mariner/>, is the gateway to electronic information created and maintained at the seven campuses of the University of Maine System Libraries. It provides access to Web sites and other online resources available through the UMS Libraries, the Maine State Library, Bangor Public Library, and the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library.

### **6.13.3 Library Checkout Privileges**

Fogler Library is open for use to members of the university community and the public. Checkout privileges are reserved for students, faculty, and staff of the University of Maine System and Maine residents who apply for courtesy borrowing. The MaineCard is required for checkout; it must be linked to the library database to be valid. The Circulation desk at the library desk activates the MaineCard for first-time checkout of library materials. Faculty may check out most books for a semester; renewal is required to hold material longer than the initial period.

### **6.13.4 Interlibrary Loan**

Items not held by Fogler Library are available through Interlibrary Loan. Services are limited to University of Maine faculty, staff, students, and corporate/research cardholders. Request forms may be submitted electronically, in person, or by mail.

Fogler Library now distributes a weekly newsletter via email to faculty. Anyone wishing not to receive this mailing may request that it not be sent. The Newsletter contains weekly items of interest to faculty members, updates on acquisitions or budget, and other items.

### **6.14 Recycling**

Paper is the number one recyclable material generated in offices and classrooms campus-wide. Each office and classroom has one or more blue or green "Paper Only" recycling bins. All paper products are collected in the paper recycling bins. For additional information about recycling on campus see <http://umaine.edu/ofm/campus-services/recycling/>.

### **6.15 Presidential Achievement Awards**

The President of the University of Maine recognizes faculty for outstanding and distinguished service. Three achievement awards may be given each academic year to faculty or professional staff. Each awardee receives a medallion and \$1500 at the Honors Convocation. Faculty or professional staff who receive a medallion may wear it at all official functions of the University. <https://umaine.edu/provost/awards-recognitions/>

#### **6.15.1 Presidential Research and Creative Achievement Award**

A faculty member who has attained distinction in research or creative achievement may receive this annual award. During the spring semester, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs solicits nominations. The Faculty Research Funds Committee reviews them and then makes recommendations to the President.

#### **6.15.2 Presidential Outstanding Teaching Award**

A tenured University of Maine faculty member who has demonstrated outstanding commitment to and ability in teaching, while maintaining a commitment to scholarship and public service may receive this annual award. The Provost solicits nominations during the spring semester. A committee of faculty, students, and administrators reviews the nominations and then makes recommendations to the President.

#### **6.15.3 Presidential Public Service Achievement Award**

A faculty or professional staff member who has demonstrated distinguished public service may receive this annual award. During the spring semester, the Provost solicits nominations. A committee of faculty and professional representatives screens the nominations and then makes recommendations to the President.

### **6.16 Teaching Services**

#### **6.16.1 Center for Excellence in Teaching and Assessment**

The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Assessment, 229 Alumni Hall, is a resource for faculty. Its mission is to foster excellence in teaching and learning at the University of Maine. <http://www.umaine.edu/teaching/>

#### **6.16.2 Faculty Development Center**

The Faculty Development Center (581-1925) is a help center specifically for supporting faculty who wish to integrate technology into their courses. It provides several high-end workstations and a staff to work with faculty. Seminars and grants are offered through the Center to assist faculty in completing technology projects. Online information is available at <http://www.umaine.edu/fdc/>.

#### **6.16.3 Advance Rising Tide Center**

Provide support for effective policies, programs, and professional development opportunities aimed at the recruitment, retention, and advancement of women faculty.

### **Motion Approved**

## RESOLUTION

### ***Resolution by the University of Maine Faculty Senate***

to University of Maine System and the Board of Trustees concerning

### ***Financial Sustainability and Academic Excellence***

Whereas:

- For FY 13, FY 14 and FY 15, the State of Maine has held appropriations to the University of Maine System flat or with small net reductions and The University of Maine System Board of Trustees, froze tuition and fee revenue for in-state undergraduate students for three years (FY 13, FY 14 and FY 15)

Whereas

- The impact of System-wide services consolidation and financial re-distribution thus far seem to have had a negative impact on our academic mission, our students, our staff and our faculty at the University of Maine.

Whereas:

- Past declines in enrollment at UMaine prior to 2012 and consistently throughout the University of Maine System, catalyzed by the declining high school demographic, resulted in significant revenue loss.

Whereas:

- It is critical that the faculty and staff receive salaries, salary increases and benefits that must be budgeted.

Whereas:

- Our strategic plan, called The Blue Sky Plan, was created as a growth model to develop new financial resources in support of academic and research excellence that has addressed about 47% the total structural gap

Whereas:

- The Chancellor has called for new and significant System changes to close the gap.

### **Resolution:**

We therefore call on the Chancellor of the University of Maine System and the Board of Trustees of the University of Maine System to:

- Recognize more fully the potentially negative impact on our students, staff and faculty of system wide initiatives that ultimately destabilize and disrupt academics and services at the Flagship campus of the University of Maine System without more substantive, critical and open examination in consultation with the UMaine community to ensure that the national stature of the University of Maine is not diminished.
- Stand in partnership with the UMaine leadership of the President and Cabinet in addressing the FY 15 budget challenges, while attempting to limit the negative impact on UMaine's tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service.
- Move more expeditiously and substantively to develop and propose a course of action that will define *specifically* how the System will increase public support for and investment in higher education, reduce costs and still maintain mission excellence at the campus level. The UMaine Faculty Senate would be pleased to participate in such substantive and visionary planning.
- Ensure through future planning that the success achieved by Maine's Flagship University in advancing its truly international academic and research reputation is not diminished by any System goals and actions inconsistent with the University of Maine's unique mission and excellence or substantive funding requirements as a nationally ranked, land grant research university.
- Stand in support of our successful strategic planning effort both now and in the future as a model in setting a course of financial sustainability and academic excellence for UMS.

### **Resolution Approved**

[Response to May 8 2014 meeting](#)

## **2012 – 2013 Motions**

### **September 19, 2012 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

-No motions

### **October 17, 2012 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

***Motion to Recommend Creation of the PhD in Communication  
The Program Creation, Review, and Reorganization Committee  
17 October, 2012***

In accordance with the University of Maine's Fifteen Stage Process of New Academic Program Creation, the PCRRRC has held public hearings on Friday, 21 September, 2012, on the stage eight, Full Program Review of the proposed PhD in Communication. On the basis of these hearings, in which all attendees voiced unalloyed support for the program, the PCRRRC recommends the Faculty Senate support this proposed program at this stage eight review through passage of this motion.

**Vote: Motion Approved**

***Motion to Recommend Creation of the MS in Spatial Informatics  
The Program Creation, Review, and Reorganization Committee  
17 October, 2012***

In accordance with the University of Maine's Fifteen Stage Process of New Academic Program Creation, the PCRRRC has held public hearings on Friday, 21 September, 2012, on the stage two, Intent to Plan Review of the proposed MS in Spatial Informatics. On the basis of these hearings, in which all attendees voiced unalloyed support for the program, the PCRRRC recommends the Faculty Senate support this proposed program at this stage two review through passage of this motion.

**Vote: Motion Approved**

**November 14, 2012 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

***Motion to Recommend Creation of the MS in Bioinformatics The Program Creation, Review, and Reorganization Committee  
14 November, 2012***

In accordance with the University of Maine's Fifteen Stage Process of New Academic Program Creation, the PCRRRC has held public hearings on Friday, 19 October, 2012, on the stage two, Intent to Plan Review of the proposed MS in Bioinformatics. On the basis of these hearings, in which all attendees voiced unalloyed support for the program, the PCRRRC recommends the Faculty Senate support this proposed program at this stage two review through passage of this motion.

**Vote: Motion Approved**

***Motion to Recommend Creation of the BA in Human Dimensions of Climate Change The Program Creation, Review, and Reorganization Committee  
14 November, 2012***

In accordance with the University of Maine's Fifteen Stage Process of New Academic Program Creation, the PCRRRC has discussed the proposed BA in Human Dimensions of Climate Change, which the Senate had approved on 19 October, 2011, to pass stage eight, as a Full Program Review, but under the original title of a proposed BS in Climate Change and Culture. Since then, the Faculty who originated the proposal have changed the name to a BA in Human Dimensions of Climate Change, altering also some program details principally in the particular balance of courses between Anthropology and the Physical Sciences. In reviewing their alterations, the PCRRRC agreed that the proposal remained true in both substance and intent to its passed stages two and eight iterations, and so recommends the Senate support the continuation of this proposal at stage nine, in which the Provost's Council considers approval of the program.

**Vote: Motion Approved**

**December 12, 2012 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

-No motions

**January 30, 2013 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

-No motions

**February 27, 2013 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

-No motions

**April 3, 2013 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

***Motion to Recommend Approval of the Proposed Creation of the School of Food and Agriculture***

***The Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee (PCRRRC)***

**28 February, 2013**



In accordance with the approved University of Maine's Process, the PCRRRC has discussed and held the required public meeting on February 20, 2013 for the proposed creation of the School of Food and Agriculture. Discussions and the public hearing clarified several justifications for merging the departments of Plant, Soil and Environmental Sciences; Animal and Veterinary Sciences; and Food Science and Human Nutrition. The new school will improve student support relative to the existing departmental structure. The creation of a school will also address some issues identified in external program reviews and will better align the program with funding agency structure. Finding no compelling arguments against this new structure, the PCRRRC recommends that the Senate support the creation of the School of Food and Agriculture.

**Vote: Motion Approved**

## **May 1, 2013 – Faculty Senate Meeting**

### **Motion to Cancel Classes on Veterans Day**

#### **Motion:**

To observe the sacrifices that veterans and their families make for our country, the University of Maine will cancel all classes on Veterans Day (November 11) except classes that meet only one day a week, subject to:

If Veterans Day falls on a weekend the University will cancel classes on the weekday when Veterans Day is officially observed.

Because the University calendar for the next two academic years is already published, the University will not cancel classes on Veterans Day until November of 2015.

#### **Notes:**

This action supports a University of Maine student government resolution recommending that in observance of Veterans Day the University of Maine cancel classes. Resolution # 345-50-02-19-13, passed 2-19-2013.

The idea of once-a-week classes meeting on that day follows the Maine Day policy, which says: "Classes will be canceled on that day with the exception of classes, including laboratories, which meet two or fewer times per week." (<http://umaine.edu/studentaffairs/maineday/>.) Maine Day always falls on a Wednesday. The once-a-week policy makes more sense for Veterans Day, which can fall on any day of the week.

Veterans Day is not a national holiday. However, Federal government offices are closed on November 11. If Veterans Day falls on a Saturday, they are closed on Friday November 10. If Veterans Day falls on a Sunday, they are closed on Monday November 12. Our policy echoes this policy.

**Discussion:** Several spoke in favor of the Motion stating UMaine is one of two campuses that don't observe Veterans Day. Veteran students or faculty need to decide if they attend class or participate in local Veterans Day parades and events. It was stated that the holiday always falls on November 11.

Q. Why is the implementation, if the motion is passed, not until 2015?

A. Because the calendar is already in place.

Motion to move the implementation date to 2013.

**Vote:** Motion defeated

Motion to accept as written.

**Vote: Motion Approved**

Subject: Observance of Veterans Day  
From: The Academic Affairs Committee  
To: Faculty Senate  
Date: May 1, 2013

### **Resolution in Support of Veteran's Day Observances and Activities**

The Faculty Senate supports the following resolution.

The University is cancelling classes to commemorate the men and women who have served our country in the armed forces. It is not simply to give students a day off from class. We therefore expect that the University will expand and develop events on that day to include the campus community in this commemoration and encourage a campus conversation about veterans, veteran issues, promotion of peace and other appropriate topics.

**Vote: Motion Approved**

### **Motion to Approve Transfer of SPIA to CLAS**

Whereas,



the PCRRRC has reviewed the proposal to move the School of Policy and International Affairs from the Graduate School to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences;

reservations were presented about the benefits of the move by the John Murphy Chair of International Business Policy and Strategy in the Maine School of Business;

these were distributed and posted and a committee meeting was held with deans, directors and chairs of the units involved;

responses were made to the questions raised and although not to the satisfaction of the original respondent there was strong support by all of the participating units; and

the committee decided that positive affects of the move were presented and that these do not appear to negatively impact students or faculty.

Therefore, the PCRRRC moves that the Faculty Senate approve the transfer of SPIA from the Graduate School to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

+++++

#### **Notes: Summary of PCRRRC process to move SPIA to CLAS.**

Posted by Brian Robinson (co-chair PCRRRC) and Michael Petersen (chair PCRRRC),

April 27, 2013.

#### **Phase 2.**

The presenters of the SPIA proposal were informed that the process needed to go through the PCRRRC on Feb. 6, 2013 and pre-proposal was submitted on March 7, 2013. The pre-proposal was complete.

#### **Phase 3.**

Before the pre-proposal was moved to a final proposal, John Mahon communicated strong dissatisfaction with the plan. A meeting was scheduled for April 12, with John and the deans, directors, and chairs of the SPIA proposal. The meeting was scheduled prior to submission of the final proposal to help resolve issues. It was well attended except that John could not make it and instead sent an email with his list of concerns on the day of the meeting. The full list was read and addressed point by point. John's letter and a summary of responses with the pre-proposal were posted on the PCRRRC web page. The pre-proposal went to a full proposal, essentially as resubmission of the pre-proposal with proper cover letter as agreed upon at the meeting of April 12.

After the lengthy meeting of August 12 we did not propose to repeat the meeting in 10 days (as required for a public hearing), but rather that with proper posting it could be presented at the Senate Meeting of May 1. This was intended as a means to allow the proposal to be considered this year. John's comments were intended to stop the proposed move of SPIA altogether, with no suggestions for improving it, and given that during the meeting of April 12, the benefits of the plan were enumerated, we chose to move if forward. There has been a great deal of information exchange in the mean time with much of it posted on the PCRRRC web page. At this point there has not been additional support to stop the SPIA proposal, beyond John's continued effort, but the issue has been raised as to whether PCRRRC procedures have been adequately followed. This accompanied letters of support for the SPIA proposal from administrators of SPIA and CLASS and additional polling of SPIA cooperating faculty from both sides of the argument.

We want to make it clear that we are seeking an expedited Phase 3, lacking a formal public hearing (which requires ten days notice) but with extensive communication at the committee meeting of April 12 and posting of pertinent materials for discussion before the May 1 Senate meeting. We consider that John's comments have been fully presented, as part of the proper procedures of the PCRRRC. We seek to expedite the process so that it will not be delayed until the next year, but with no intent to limit the already extensive communication.

We add that part of the problem stems from ambiguities in the PCRRRC manual with regard to the decision to move a pre-proposal to a full proposal, resulting in uncertainty and delays on the part of administrators and the PCRRRC. This is a problem we intend to address in the following year, but it is also one of the reasons that we do not want to unnecessarily delay current proposals.

A motion was made to table the SPIA motion.

**Vote:** Motion defeated

Motion will be discussed. A video from John Mahon was played since he could not attend the Senate meeting. He opposes the motion. Several questioned whether SPIA faculty were included in conversations regarding the move to CLAS. PCRRRC policy states faculty needs to be involved. James Settele, Director of SPIA stated that faculty were involved and surveyed. Mario Teisl stated that the PAC did meet and were unanimously in favor of the move, changing the reporting line won't change the mission. The move came up because of inconsistency of undergraduate IA and was mentioned in an external review; undergraduate being under the Graduate School doesn't work. This move will not change the interdisciplinary or mission. Several stated that the move would strengthen the program.

**Vote: Motion Approved**

A motion was made to cancel the May 29, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting.

**Vote: Motion Approved**

## 2011 – 2012 Motions

### September 21, 2011 Faculty Senate Meeting

#### MOTION TITLE: Re-Establishment of Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Advisory IT Committee

Motion: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee recommends that the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate IT Advisory Committee be re-established for academic year 2011/2012.

Rationale: The Instructional Technology plan is within the purview of the faculty by virtue of the fact that it is integral to the academic mission of the University. The faculty need to be active in the evolution of the IT plan. This committee had organized faculty representation so that the interests of faculty and UM were coordinated and prioritized; and is necessary for the University of Maine, to aggressively identify the structure, composition, and organization at the System level.

**Voting Results:** unanimously

#### MOTION TITLE: *Motion to Urge the President of the University of Maine to sign the Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities*

##### Background:

In furtherance of a faculty motion submitted by the Library Committee on 2 April 2008, the University of Maine is currently acquiring institutional repository capabilities that are being instituted through Fogler Library. (See Preamble and Motion to Support an Institutional Repository, Motion Passed on April 2, 2008, <http://umaine.edu/facultysenate/motions-passed-2/2007-2008-motions/>) With a functional institutional repository now in the process of being instituted, it makes sense to revisit and pursue the specific further actions outlined in the 2008 motion that should be taken to create appropriate incentives for faculty and students to contribute to the repository.

In order to provide legal clarity to allow all works of faculty and students to be deposited in the long-term university repository on a day forward basis, it would be highly useful for the University of Maine to establish itself as an open access university as many other universities have done. An initial step towards this goal is to request the President of the University of Maine to sign the **Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities** ... as over 300 other universities and research institutions have done. The text of the declaration is attached as an appendix to this motion and a link to the signatories is provided.

The University of Maine should also explore the possibility of joining the Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions (COAPI) which was created in August 2011 and currently numbers 22 North American universities.

The international **Berlin Open Access Conference** will be in Washington D.C. in November 2011 and COAPI will meet just before that conference. We recommend that the administration send at least one representative to both events and recommend that at least one University of Maine faculty member attend.

**Motion:** The University of Maine Faculty Senate requests and urges the President of the University of Maine to sign the **Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities** before the international **Berlin Open Access Conference** in Washington D.C. in November 2011

##### Appendix to Motion:

#### Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities

##### Preface:

The Internet has fundamentally changed the practical and economic realities of distributing scientific knowledge and cultural heritage. For the first time ever, the Internet now offers the chance to constitute a global and interactive representation of human knowledge, including cultural heritage and the guarantee of worldwide access.

We, the undersigned, feel obliged to address the challenges of the Internet as an emerging functional medium for distributing knowledge. Obviously, these developments will be able to significantly modify the nature of scientific publishing as well as the existing system of quality assurance.

In accordance with the spirit of the Declaration of the Budapest Open Access Initiative, the ECHO Charter and the Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing, we have drafted the Berlin Declaration to promote the Internet as a functional instrument for a global scientific knowledge base and human reflection and to specify measures which research policy makers, research institutions, funding agencies, libraries, archives and museums need to consider.

##### Goals:

Our mission of disseminating knowledge is only half complete if the information is not made widely and readily available to society. New possibilities of knowledge dissemination not only through the classical form but also and increasingly through the open access paradigm via the Internet have to be supported. We define open access as a comprehensive source of human knowledge and cultural heritage that has been approved by the scientific community.

In order to realize the vision of a global and accessible representation of knowledge, the future Web has to be sustainable, interactive, and transparent. Content and software tools must be openly accessible and compatible.

### **Definition of an Open Access Contribution:**

Establishing open access as a worthwhile procedure ideally requires the active commitment of each and every individual producer of scientific knowledge and holder of cultural heritage. Open access contributions include original scientific research results, raw data and metadata, source materials, digital representations of pictorial and graphical materials and scholarly multimedia material.

Open access contributions must satisfy two conditions:

1. The author(s) and right holder(s) of such contributions grant(s) to all users a free, irrevocable, worldwide, right of access to, and a license to copy, use, distribute, transmit and display the work publicly and to make and distribute derivative works, in any digital medium for any responsible purpose, subject to proper attribution of authorship (community standards, will continue to provide the mechanism for enforcement of proper attribution and responsible use of the published work, as they do now), as well as the right to make small numbers of printed copies for their personal use.
2. A complete version of the work and all supplemental materials, including a copy of the permission as stated above, in an appropriate standard electronic format is deposited (and thus published) in at least one online repository using suitable technical standards (such as the Open Archive definitions) that is supported and maintained by an academic institution, scholarly society, government agency, or other well established organization that seeks to enable open access, unrestricted distribution, inter operability, and long-term archiving.

### **Supporting the Transition to the Electronic Open Access Paradigm:**

Our organizations are interested in the further promotion of the new open access paradigm to gain the most benefit for science and society. Therefore, we intend to make progress by:

- encouraging our researchers/grant recipients to publish their work according to the principles of the open access paradigm.
- encouraging the holders of cultural heritage to support open access by providing their resources on the Internet.
- developing means and ways to evaluate open access contributions and online journals in order to maintain the standards of quality assurance and good scientific practice.
- advocating that open access publication be recognized in promotion and tenure evaluation.
- advocating the intrinsic merit of contributions to an open access infrastructure by software tool development, content provision, metadata creation, or the publication of individual articles.

We realize that the process of moving to open access changes the dissemination of knowledge with respect to legal and financial aspects. Our organizations aim to find solutions that support further development of the existing legal and financial frameworks in order to facilitate optimal use and access.

### **Signing Instructions:**

Governments, universities, research institutions, funding agencies, foundations, libraries, museums, archives, learned societies and professional associations who share the vision expressed in the Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities are therefore invited to join the signatories that have already signed the Declaration.

Please contact:

Prof. Dr. Peter Gruss

President of the Max Planck Society

Hofgartenstraße 8

D-80539 Munich

Germany

[praesident@gv.mpg.de](mailto:praesident@gv.mpg.de)

### **References:**

#### ***Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities***

Text of Statement: <http://oa.mpg.de/lang/en-uk/berlin-prozess/berliner-erklarung/> or [http://www.zim.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/berlin\\_declaration.pdf](http://www.zim.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/berlin_declaration.pdf)

Signatory List: <http://oa.mpg.de/lang/en-uk/berlin-prozess/signatoren/>

**Voting Result:** 25 approved; 1 opposed; 1 abstention

**THIS MOTION WAS AMENDED see December 14, 2011**

**MOTION TITLE:** University of Maine Faculty Senate Motion for Principles Governing Distance Learning

I. Introduction:

As a residential campus, the University of Maine must meet its students' expectations of having up to date and cutting-edge technologies within the traditional classroom structure, including the use of hybrid and innovative modes of delivery. Given the core role of emerging technologies in responsible education, research, and public outreach, distance education must be seen as part of a continuum of offerings, one that cannot afford to undermine on-campus classes, which very successfully continue to serve our students.

Honoring our role as the Land- and Sea-Grant flagship campus, we continue to strive to make our research and teaching openly available to our diverse constituencies across the state. We must strike the balance between providing the highest quality residential program, using the most efficacious course delivery to sustain this quality and be balanced with our responsibility to assist the University of Maine System in providing all constituents the best education possible.

In all questions of teaching, research, and outreach, including questions regarding the delivery of education through distance modalities, it is incumbent on us to reiterate that the primary responsibility for curricular matters lies with the Faculty at the University of Maine. Current proposals from University College staking out the control and oversight of distance education system-wide would potentially infringe upon this established policy at the University of Maine.

We concur with the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) that: As with all other curricular matters, the faculty should have primary responsibility for determining the policies and practices of the institution in regard to distance education. The rules governing distance education and its technologies should be approved by vote of the faculty concerned or of a representative faculty body, officially adopted by the appropriate authority, and published and distributed to all concerned.

The applicable academic unit—usually a department or program—should determine the extent to which the new technologies of distance education will be utilized, and the form and manner of their use. These determinations should conform with institutional policies. (Retrieved 9/3/11

<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/programs/legal/topics/dl-ip-ownership.htm>)

Therefore, University of Maine Faculty shall have primary responsibility for all distance education originating from the University of Maine.

II. Statement of Principles regarding Faculty responsibilities with regard to distance delivery of education

Accordingly, in response to the increasing development and use of technological modalities of course delivery, and specifically in response to any attempt on the part of entities other than the Faculty to limit or control any aspect of the curriculum, the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate has prepared the following statement of principles to reiterate clearly the scope of these responsibilities with regard to distance delivery of education.

1. The University of Maine Faculty has primary responsibility for all matters pertaining to the undergraduate and graduate curricula, including all courses, modules, majors, minors, degrees, and certificate programs offered by the University of Maine.
2. The Faculty at the University of Maine shall be involved in the oversight of distance-education courses to the same extent as in other courses with regard to factors such as course development and approval, selection of qualified Faculty to teach, pedagogical determinations about appropriate class size, and oversight of course offerings by the appropriate Faculty committee to ensure conformity with previously established traditions of course quality and relevance to programs.
3. The Faculty member (or an appropriate Faculty body) who teaches the course (or adopts a pre-existing course) for use in distance education shall exercise control over the future use, modification, and distribution of recorded instructional material and shall determine whether the material should be revised or withdrawn from use.
4. The Faculty alone will assess any balance among modalities, say, between on-line and traditional classroom offerings, on the basis of their expertise in all curricular matters. Unless stated in the Faculty member's initial or revised employment letter or contract, no Faculty member will be required to develop or to teach a distance education course.
5. It is well documented that there is a significant increase in demands on Faculty time in the design, creation and delivery of distance education for Faculty members, far more than for comparable traditional courses. For example, the time spent on-line answering student inquiries typically takes more than double the amount of time required in interacting with students in comparable traditional classes. Increasing demands on Faculty time can only undermine sustained excellence in teaching and research, unless it is balanced with adjustments in other responsibilities.
6. Determination of class size shall always be based upon pedagogy, as determined by the Faculty member and her or his immediate unit. Unrealistic class sizes directly work against proven pedagogic excellence, penalizing students in over-loaded courses.
7. In order to carry out their instructional responsibilities, professional development and ongoing and sustained technical support must be provided for all Faculty members who choose to develop distance education courses. The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Assessment and the Faculty Development Center at present provide and coordinate such efforts; other entities tasked with such responsibilities may emerge in future.
8. As a professional within her or his discipline, the Faculty member alone shall determine the technology or technologies employed in the delivery of the courses the Faculty member develops and teaches.

9. The Faculty member (or an appropriate Faculty body) who teaches the course (or adopts a pre-existing course) for use in distance education shall exercise control over the future use, modification, and distribution of recorded instructional material and shall determine whether the material should be revised or withdrawn from use in conformance with the UMS Full Statement of Policy Governing Patents and Copyrights [http://www.maine.edu/system/policy\\_manual/policy\\_section209.php](http://www.maine.edu/system/policy_manual/policy_section209.php)

10. Information Technology (IT), Continuing Education (CED), Division of Lifelong Learning (DLL), and the Center for Teaching Excellence and Assessment (CETA) shall be collaborative partners in support of the educational mission of the University. Evolving pedagogical best practices in the delivery of distance education shall be supported by all available resources, to cover the development and/or use of course management systems, hard- and software packages, new technologies of communication and delivery, and functions related to the efficient and seamless delivery of education, all fitted appropriately to the content and goals of the course or program.

11. Development and approval of student evaluation tools that are appropriate to course pedagogy and technology continue to lie within the purview of the Faculty. Student evaluation instruments other than those approved by the Faculty are not official evaluation instruments of the University of Maine.

#### **Motion**

The Academic Affairs Committee moves approval of these guiding principles by the Faculty Senate and urges the administration and President of the University of Maine to assure that the principles stated above are adopted as policy wherever possible, affirmed and adhered to in all decisions relating to distance delivery of education at, or through, the University of Maine.

**Voting Results:** unanimously

#### **October 19, 2011 Faculty Senate Meeting**

##### **Motion: General definition for service-learning**

Service and Outreach Committee Recommendation – October 2011

##### **Rationale:**

The Service and Outreach Committee of the Faculty Senate is recommending passage of the following motion, which includes a general definition for service learning at UMaine. We are recommending this definition for service-learning because it was one of several that were referenced in the Service and Outreach Committee report to the Faculty Senate in May 2007, was taken from the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse site then and is still in use on their site today[<http://www.servicelearning.org/what-is-service-learning>, accessed 9/27/2011], and it is more inclusive of all the service-learning type of activities that might be engaged in or through a land grant institution like UMaine.

##### **Motion:**

The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine adopts the following general definition for service-learning. This definition will serve as a guide in the development of service-learning opportunities and partnerships between students, University of Maine faculty and staff, and communities throughout the State of Maine. Service-learning at the University of Maine is defined as “a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities” (National Service-Learning Clearinghouse).

**Voting Results:** 23 for, 0 against, 1 abstention

**Motion:** B.S in Climate Change and Culture

PCRRC Assessment and Recommendation

15 October 2011

Background and Committee Process: [for Stage 8 sequence]

9/21/11: Information on proposal distributed to Faculty Senate for review and comments.

9/28/11: Meeting with PCRRC and proponents [Kristin Sobolik, Jim Roscoe, Joseph Kelley, Scott Johnson].

10/7/11: Campus-wide hearing; included the proposal's proponents, members of the PCRRC, and members of the campus community.

10/13/11: PCRRC meeting to discuss proposal and draft recommendation for Faculty Senate's approval.

10/19/11: PCRRC recommendation on Faculty Senate agenda.

Overview of the Proposal:

Members of the PCRRC and people who attended the campus-wide hearing generally agreed on the following strengths and advantages of the proposal:

It is well crafted, comprehensive, and closely follows the guidelines for new program proposals.

If implemented, it will improve connections between departments and colleges; it will bridge social and environmental sciences; this adheres closely to one of the University of Maine's goals: to improve interdisciplinary teaching and research.

It relies on established and productive departments and programs at the University of Maine that enjoy international reputations: Earth Sciences, Anthropology, and Climate Change; it identifies a broad range of personnel who are prepared to contribute to the major.

It includes a modest requirement of adding a single new courses: ANT 110 Climate Change and Culture Seminar; the rest of the degree requirements will come from existing or easily modified courses.

As the proposal notes, “the core of the program is already largely in place.” It makes use of existing library resources, equipment, and space, with perhaps additional support from grants for equipment.

Questions Raised by PCRRRC and Members of the University of Maine Community:

The inclusion of a faculty line in the proposal was discussed at length. Questions included whether the program could exist without the line, and if the line could be added in the future after the program is introduced and students matriculate. In sum, the proponents argued that a new faculty line would be crucial for the creation of the program and to ensure its success. The proposal PCRRRC reviewed did not include the “fiscal note” that is required when a proposed program requires new resources.

Similarly, the proposal for two teaching assistants – one in Anthropology and one in Sciences – triggered significant discussion. Members of PCRRRC noted that the addition of two teaching assistants to those departments would probably come out of a defined and limited pool of teaching assistants at the University that are determined by the Graduate School.

The nature of the impact of teaching loads in both Anthropology and Earth Sciences was discussed. Questions were raised about the newly designed Ph.D. in Anthropology and Environmental Policy and its impact on teaching loads to implement and sustain the B.S. degree in Climate Change and Culture. Moreover, the question of the level and frequency of teaching support among faculty with contracts that stipulate a high percentage of research time (75%, for example) will have to be addressed in order make sure that the large number of “faculty involved in the program”(Appendix I) are actually engaged in undergraduate instruction described in the BS program.

The feasibility of having students who are already matriculated at the University of Maine transition to the program, or whether it would be exclusively designed around a selected pool of applicants (given the target for a limited number of majors) was discussed at length. Proponents suggested that both cohorts could be accommodated.

PCRRRC raised questions about the viability of the program should the goals of attracting a large number of out-of-state students fall short of the anticipated numbers. Proponents responded that the program should attract a large number of students from outside Maine because it will be unique among New England’s universities and colleges. The PCRRRC notes that more attention will have to be paid to advertising strategies to accomplish the goal of matriculating out-of-state students. Proponents argued that the central themes of climate change and its impact on humans should be enormously attractive for university undergraduates in the twenty-first century.

PCRRRC requested fuller articulation of the skill sets that would be developed for students, and the proponents added language clarifying specific student learning outcomes (see II, C).

The question of double counting majors to credit both Anthropology and Earth Sciences was raised and discussed. PCRRRC notes that although it acknowledges the issue, is not responsible for the resolution of this question and its implementation. We recommend immediate administrative attention to the matter of double counting majors, should the B.S. be approved.

Questions were raised at the campus-wide hearing on the challenges of having students navigate the program’s requirements given its location in two departments from different colleges. Those challenges need to be addressed should the degree be approved.

PCRRRC Deliberations (10/13/11) and Summary Comments:

The proposal is timely and problem oriented; it articulates an undergraduate concentration that should have great appeal to students in the twenty-first century; students would improve their understanding of the impact that climate change is having on humans and learn strategies for coping with those changes. It will be a unique program in the nation; this will be especially important for attracting out-of-state students to the University of Maine as a “first choice” school; it pays close attention to recruitment.

PCRRRC notes that it is not the committee’s mandate to evaluate or verify the Total Financial Consideration (VI) component of the proposal.

PCRRRC notes that the fiscal note from the Office of the Vice President for Administration and Finance, as stipulated in Stage 7 of the PCRRRC Policy and Procedures Manual, is not included in the proposal.

## **Recommendation**

PCRRRC recommends moving the proposal to Stage 9 of the Full Program Proposal sequence, based on the findings expressed above.

## **Discussion**

Q. What is Stage 9?

A. That’s when it is sent to the Provost for approval. It is either approved or returned to the unit with questions or revisions. If the Provost gives approval it is then sent to the President for approval.

**Voting Results:** 21 in favor, 1 against, 1 abstention.

**November 16, 2011 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee [PCRRC]  
Assessment and Recommendation Intent to Plan: Ph.D. in Communication  
4 November 2011**

**Background and Committee Process:** [for Stage 2 sequence]

9/21/11: Information on proposal distributed to Faculty Senate for review and comments.

10/18/11: Meeting with PCRRC and proponents [Nathan Stormer, Dan Sandweiss].

11/16/11: PCRRC recommendation on Faculty Senate agenda.

**Overview of the Proposal:**

Members of the PCRRC generally agreed on the following strengths and advantages of the proposal:

- \* It is comprehensive, persuasive, and closely follows the guidelines for Intent to Plan proposals.
- \* It builds on a successful Independent Ph.D. that has been in place since 2007, so in essence it seeks to convert or “normalize” a doctoral program that has been tested. As a result, this Intent to Plan is more detailed and documented than typical proposals at the Stage 2 level.
- \* It has been reviewed and approved by the faculty of the Department of Communication and Journalism. It has the full support of Dan Sandweiss, Dean and Associate Provost for Graduate Studies, and of the Graduate Board [formally approved: 17 February 2011].
- \* It stipulates that the program can be initiated without the need for new personnel, facilities, or equipment. In the current environment of budgetary constraint, this represents a positive feature of the program.
- \* It articulates a program that will collaborate with Maine’s Sustainability Solutions Initiative and other programs. This addresses one of the University of Maine’s signature goals: to improve interdisciplinary teaching and research.
- \* If implemented, it should be competitive among the University of Maine’s cohort of graduate programs in New England and the nation.

**Questions and Suggestions Raised by PCRRC:**

- \* The question of teaching assistants should be addressed in more detail at the next stage of the process. For example, what impact will the doctoral program have in shifting teaching assistants from the Master’s program over time?
- \* The long-term impact of the doctoral program on the teaching loads of the faculty in the department should be more clearly articulated in the next stage of the proposal’s development. For example, what impact will a robust doctoral program have on an undergraduate degree in Communication that is one of the largest majors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences?
- \* PCRRC suggests that the Full Program Proposal more explicitly defines the interdisciplinary nature of the program and more fully explains the anticipated role of graduate faculty who not members of the Department of Communication and Journalism.

**PCRRC Summary Comments:**

- \* The proposal is important for expanding the number of graduate programs in the humanities and social sciences at the University of Maine. It emerges from an existing Independent Ph.D. program, so there is every reason to anticipate its success in moving through the sequence of stages for official approval of new academic degree programs.
- \* PCRRC notes that it all requirements of the Intent to Plan (Stage 2) have been met and addressed in the proposal and at the meeting with the proponents.

**Recommendation**

PCRRC recommends moving the proposal to Stage 3 of the Intent to Plan sequence, based on the findings expressed above.

**Voting Results:** Approved 24, No 0, Abstention 0

**December 14, 2011 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**MOTION: University of Maine Faculty Senate Motion for Principles Governing Distance / On-Line Learning**

**I. Introduction:**

As a residential campus, the University of Maine must meet its students’ expectations of having up to date and cutting-edge technologies within the traditional course structure, including the use of hybrid and innovative modes of delivery. Given the core role of emerging technologies in responsible education, research, and public outreach, distance / on-line education serves best as part of a continuum of offerings, one that complements on-campus classes, which very successfully continue to serve our students.

Honoring our role as the Land- and Sea-Grant flagship campus, we continue to strive to make our research and teaching openly available to our diverse constituencies across the state. We must balance providing the highest quality residential program, using the most efficacious course deliveries to sustain this quality, and our responsibility to assist the University of Maine System in providing all constituents the best education possible.

In all questions of teaching, research, and outreach, including questions regarding the delivery of education through distance / on-line modalities, it is incumbent on us to reiterate that the primary responsibility for curricular matters lies with the Faculty at the University of Maine, working



collaboratively with our Administration.

We concur with the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) that: *As with all other curricular matters, the faculty should have primary responsibility for determining the policies and practices of the institution in regard to distance education. The rules governing distance education and its technologies should be approved by vote of the faculty concerned or of a representative faculty body, officially adopted by the appropriate authority, and published and distributed to all concerned.*

*The applicable academic unit—usually a department or program—should determine the extent to which the new technologies of distance education will be utilized, and the form and manner of their use. These determinations should conform with institutional policies.* (Retrieved 9/3/11

<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/programs/legal/topics/dl-ip-ownership.htm>)

Therefore, University of Maine Faculty shall have primary responsibility for all distance / on-line education originating from the University of Maine.

## **II. The Motion:**

The Academic Affairs Committee moves approval of the following guiding principles regarding Faculty responsibilities with regard to distance / on-line education to reiterate clearly the Faculty's unique purview in designing, teaching, and implementing all UMaine courses and curricula, including distance / on-line educational materials, and urges the Administration and President of the University of Maine to assure that these principles are adopted as policy wherever possible, affirmed and adhered to in all decisions relating to distance / on-line education at, or through, the University of Maine.

1. The University of Maine Faculty has primary responsibility for all matters pertaining to the undergraduate and graduate curricula, including all courses, modules, majors, minors, degrees, and certificate programs offered by the University of Maine.
2. The Faculty at the University of Maine shall be involved in the oversight of distance / on-line education courses to the same extent as in other courses with regard to factors such as course development and approval, selection of qualified Faculty to teach, pedagogical determinations about appropriate class size, and oversight of course offerings by the appropriate Faculty committee to ensure conformity with previously established traditions of course quality and relevance to programs.
3. The Faculty member (or an appropriate Faculty body) who teaches the course (or adopts a pre-existing course) for use in distance / on-line education shall exercise control over the future use, modification, and distribution of recorded instructional material and shall determine whether the material should be revised or withdrawn from use.
4. The Faculty of each department or unit will assess any balance among modalities, say, between on-line and traditional course offerings, on the basis of their expertise in all curricular matters.
5. It is well documented that there is often a significant increase in demands on Faculty time in the design, creation and delivery of distance / on-line education for Faculty members, far more than for comparable traditional courses. For example, the time spent on-line answering student inquiries typically takes more than double the amount of time required in interacting with students in comparable traditional classes. Increasing demands on Faculty time can only undermine sustained excellence in teaching and research, unless it is balanced with adjustments in other responsibilities.
6. Determination of class size shall always be based upon pedagogy, as determined by the Faculty member in consultation with her or his unit and its chairperson. Unrealistic class sizes directly work against proven pedagogic excellence, penalizing students in over-loaded courses.
7. In order to carry out their instructional responsibilities, professional development and ongoing and sustained technical support must be provided for all Faculty members who choose to develop distance / on-line education courses. The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Assessment (CETA), the Division of Life-Long Learning (DLL), and the Faculty Development Center at present provide and coordinate such efforts; other entities tasked with such responsibilities may emerge in future.
8. As a professional within her or his discipline, the Faculty member in discussion with her or his unit shall determine the specific technology or technologies employed in the delivery of the courses she or he develops and teaches.
9. The Faculty member (or an appropriate Faculty body) who teaches the course (or adopts a pre-existing course) for use in distance / on-line education shall exercise control over the future use, modification, and distribution of recorded instructional material and shall determine whether the material should be revised or withdrawn from use in conformance with the UMS Full Statement of Policy Governing Patents and Copyrights [http://www.maine.edu/system/policy\\_manual/policy\\_section209.php](http://www.maine.edu/system/policy_manual/policy_section209.php)
10. Information Technology (IT), Continuing Education (CED), Division of Lifelong Learning (DLL), and the Center for Teaching Excellence and Assessment (CETA) shall be collaborative partners in support of the educational mission of the University. Evolving pedagogical best practices in distance / on-line education shall be supported by all available resources, to cover the development and/or use of course management systems, hard- and software packages, new technologies of communication and delivery, and functions related to the efficient and seamless delivery of education, all fitted appropriately to the content and goals of the course or program.
11. Development and approval of student evaluation tools that are appropriate to course pedagogy and technology continue to lie within the purview of the Faculty as described by Article 10, B. 2. & 3. of the *UMS / AFUM Contract*. Student evaluation instruments other than those approved by the Faculty are not official evaluation instruments of the University of Maine.

**Voting Results: Unanimous**

**January 25, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting**



– No motions

## **February 22, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting**

### **Motion re. Participation Policy for Online Courses (as amended and approved)**

From: The Academic Affairs Committee

Date: February 22, 2012

Discussion:

Revised federal regulation requires that the University of Maine have a written policy specific to participation in an online class (a policy distinct from the policy for a regular live class). This requirement is due to a revision in Title IV of the Higher Education Act and is known as the Federal Program Integrity Rules, which became effective July 1, 2011.

Peggy Crawford of Financial Aid provided this explanation:

New Rule: Documenting Attendance

ED notes “a student logging in with no participation thereafter many indicate that the student is not even present at the computer past that point. There is also a potential that someone other than the student may have logged into a class using the student’s information. . . . an institution must demonstrate that a student participated in class or was otherwise engaged in an academically-related activity, such as by contributing to an online discussion or initiating contact with a faculty member to ask a course-related question.”

This rule is part of determining last date of attendance and the new definition of “academically-related activity.”

Further, in developing the policy, “it seemed appropriate to focus on ‘participation’ instead of ‘attendance.’”

The policy below seeks to provide an indication to the students about what “participation” might entail, while leaving the actual details to the faculty member as delineated in his or her course syllabus. We must have a policy and the committee is comfortable with the wording because the policy clearly leaves the details of defining participation to the faculty member.

Motion: The Faculty Senate approves the following language for the Undergraduate Catalog:

The University of Maine expects all students enrolled in online coursework to actively participate in the course. For fully asynchronous courses and for asynchronous elements of hybrid courses, “participation” is defined as the student’s virtual presence for, and participation in discussions, activities, and related forms of electronic contact occurring in a course’s learning environment(s): e.g. participation in on-line discussion about academic matters, podcast viewing, group writing sessions, whole-class or one-on-one chat, completion of assignments. Broad discretion regarding the required frequency and quality of a student’s participation rests with the instructor of record and should be delineated in the course syllabus.

Discussion:

Most examples are for participation, most seem to be more synchronous.

**Vote:** Approved 22, No 0, Abstention 0.

### **Motion re. the Undergraduate Catalog descriptions of minors and concentrations (as amended and approved)**

From: The Academic Affairs Committee

Date: February 22, 2012

Discussion: The language below originated with the Associate Deans and Directors group to address two issues of omission in the Undergraduate Catalog. (1) The Undergraduate Catalog contains no complete definition of minors. Although the Faculty Senate decided that a minimum of 18 credits is to be required of all minors, other questions have arisen about who is eligible to declare minors and about when and how minors are to be listed on transcripts. The description seeks to address those issues. (2) The Undergraduate Catalog contains no current description of an academic concentration within a major. This language seeks to address this omission, and is intended to allow academic units as much discretion as possible in shaping the size and content of their concentrations.

Note that there is a distinction between a minor and a concentration. Because a concentration is part of a major, it must be completed at the time the baccalaureate is awarded. On the other hand, a student can complete a minor within a two-year period after gaining their undergraduate degree. A minor shows on the transcript when declared. A concentration shows on the transcript only when completed.

These descriptions seem—to the committee—fair and reasoned.

Motion: The Faculty Senate approves the following language for the Undergraduate Catalog:

Minors

Minors are sets of courses designed to provide a student with substantial knowledge of a subject area outside of their major course of study. A minor is available to any degree-matriculated student as long as the program of study for the minor does not significantly overlap with the student’s major course of study. The unit or units involved will determine how much overlap is appropriate at the time of declaration. Normally no more than one third of the requirements for the minor can overlap with the major requirements.

A student's transcript will indicate a declared minor. However, students need to officially declare their minor with the department, unit, or school where the minor is offered. If this is not done, there is no guarantee that proper certification of the minor will appear on the final transcript. If a student begins work on a minor but fails to meet all of the requirements, there is no penalty.

Discussion:

Concentration is finished once graduated.

Minor allows two years, after graduation, to be completed but must be declared prior to graduation. Limiting it to two years was not stipulated before.

**Vote:** Yes 23, No 0, Abstention 0.

### **March 28, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting**

#### **Motion to Approve the Academic Calendars for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015**

**Vote:** Yes 22, No 0, Abstain 0

**Subject: Motion re. The Undergraduate Incomplete Grade Reporting Form From: The Academic Affairs Committee To: Faculty Senate Date: March 28, 2012**  
Discussion: The Office of Student Records proposed changes to the Undergraduate Incomplete Reporting Form based on the reasons listed below.

The changes proposed are designed to have the following benefits to students/faculty:

- 1) Submitting the form at the time the grade is assigned ensures that instructors don't forget to file the form in the rush at the beginning of the following semester.
- 2) Some adjunct instructors may not be returning to teach in the next semester, and if they do not submit an Incomplete Grade Reporting Form right away, they might never do so, leaving a lot of confusion for the student, the unit chair, and the student's dean's office.
- 3) Listing assignments to be completed helps clarify things for the student and creates a written record that can prevent later disputes about outstanding work.
- 4) In the event that the instructor leaves, dies, or is too ill to "teach out" the Incomplete, this listing will help a colleague to finish the course with the student and fulfill the original instructor's intentions. It also helps the academic advisor who is working with the student to be sure that the next semester is not too heavy to ensure that the student will be able to manage with the amount of work outstanding from the previous term.
- 5) The grade reflecting quality of work tells the student and the associate dean/director about the grade he or she has earned to date. Deans' offices reviewing grades between terms need to know as much as possible about the student's current grade in order to make decisions about whether the student remains in good standing or is put on probation or suspension.
- 6) A line for the printed name of the faculty member was added because signatures are often very hard to read and occasionally questions come up later. Having to go into MaineStreet to research the class and find the name of the instructor is tedious for anyone involved. The signature line ensures that unauthorized persons (e.g. the student or a friend of the student) don't file these forms. Administrative Assistants in academic units may sign for a faculty member who is not on campus when grades are posted.
- 7) The student's signature (or attached email, etc.) is necessary to ensure that the student is aware of and requested the grade of Incomplete.
- 8) The associate dean/director of the student receives a copy in order to keep a record to ensure that the student has the best chance of finishing the course.

These rationales seem—to the committee—fair and reasonable.

Motion: The Faculty Senate approves the proposed Undergraduate Incomplete Grade Reporting Form.

Discussion: It would be good to have the form online with a submit button to the appropriate college. It will most likely be online as a fillable form but will attempt to get it on to MaineStreet, no promises.

**Vote:** Yes 21, No 0, Abstain 0

#### **There is a Senate Executive Committee Resolution in Support of the Reinstatement of the BA in Theatre:**

The Faculty Senate fully supports the reinstatement of the BA in Theatre, and thanks the Theatre Department, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the Office of Academic Affairs for their diligent work in restoring this important major.

**Vote:** Yes 20, No 0, Abstain 1

### **April 25, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting**

With passage of the following motion the general education requirements become as shown at [University of Maine General Education Requirements \(Revised 2012\)](#)

#### **Resolution to adopt updated General Education Student Learning Outcomes for Demonstrated Writing Competency**

Original statement from the General Education Implementation Guidelines for Demonstrated Writing Competency (ratified by the Senate 1996). *Students are required to write throughout their academic careers and must demonstrate competency both at the introductory level and within their majors. To fulfill this requirement, students must:*

- 1) Complete ENG 101, College Composition with a grade of C or better, or be excused from this course on the basis of a placement exam.
- 2) Complete at least two writing-intensive courses, at least one of which must be within the academic major.

**DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS-** *In a writing-intensive course:*

- a) *students must have an opportunity to revise their writing in response to feedback from the instructor;*
- b) *a substantial portion of the student's final grade must be based upon the quality of the written work, and*
- c) *course enrollment should normally be limited to 25 students or less.*

The General Education Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt and ratify the following updated and streamlined set of student learning outcomes for the Demonstrated Writing Competency general education category. This change creates student learning outcomes that are clear, assessable, and understandable by students.

### **Resolution to adopt updated General Education Student Learning Outcomes for Ethics**

Original statement from the General Education Implementation Guidelines for Ethics (ratified by the Senate 1996). *Students are required to take a course or a series of courses placing substantial emphasis on discussion of ethical issues. The ethics requirement can be satisfied by 1) a stand-alone course in which ethics constitutes a substantial focus of the course, or 2) by a well defined series of courses required in a particular curriculum, wherein the treatment of ethics in any one course may be somewhat less, but which taken together sum to a substantial emphasis on ethics.*

- 1) *Courses that satisfy the ethics requirement have one or more of the following attributes:*

- a) *they teach methods of ethical analysis;*
- b) *they deal intensively with ethical issues associated with a particular*
- c)

*discipline or profession;*

- d) *they engage the student in the study of ethical questions arising*

*through the interpretation of literature or history, or social scientific analysis designed to include ethical evaluation. [In order for a course to be approved under this criterion, the treatment of ethics must be substantial rather than merely incidental. Examples: i) a course in history that focuses strongly on the ethical issues raised by a particular policy, e.g. colonialism, and the ways in which those issues were addressed or ignored, might be appropriate; ii) a course in econometrics typically would not count, but an economics course broadened to include questions of distributive justice could; iii) a course on psychophysics might not count, but a course on moral development could.]*

- 2) *Programs that undertake to integrate the treatment of ethics throughout the required curriculum may submit to the General Education Committee (GEIC) evidence that the program overall meets the Ethics requirement. The GEIC may thus approve a program (for a fixed period of time subject to regular review) as an alternative to requiring that each student's curriculum contain specifically approved courses.*

### **Resolution to adopt updated General Education Student Learning Outcomes for Science**

Original statement from the General Education Implementation Guidelines for Science (ratified by the Senate 1996). *Students are required to complete two courses in the physical or biological – sciences. This may be accomplished in two ways:*

- 1) *By completing two courses with laboratories in the basic or applied sciences;*
- 2) *By completing one approved course in the applications of scientific knowledge, plus one course with a lab in the basic or applied sciences.*

**DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS**

- 1) *A laboratory course in the applied physical or biological sciences brings basic knowledge to bear on the solution of practical problems in engineering, medicine, agriculture, forestry, and other fields for which natural science forms the foundation. Normally applied science courses require one of the basic natural sciences (biology, physics, chemistry, geology) as a prerequisite, and carry at least 4 degree credits.*

- 2) *A course in the applications of scientific knowledge has the following attributes:*

- a) *it focuses on one or more basic or applied natural sciences*
- b) *it includes significant blending of presently accepted science with its application in common situations;*
- c) *it discusses both the applications and limitations of the relevant scientific methodology;*
- d) *it includes as a major component of the course the observation of natural phenomena coupled with the gathering of data and its quantitative analysis, and its interpretation in an expository format;*

*its overall focus is on guiding students towards the scientific literacy necessary for modern life rather than on training future science professionals.*

The General Education Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt and ratify the following updated and streamlined set of student learning outcomes for the Science general education category. This change creates student learning outcomes that are clear, assessable, and understandable by students.

### **Proposed student learning outcomes and preamble:**

#### **General Education Student Learning Outcomes Science**

##### **Preamble**

Students are required to complete two courses in the physical or biological – sciences. This may be accomplished in two ways:

- . 1) By completing two courses with laboratories in the basic or applied sciences;
- . 2) By completing one approved course in the applications of scientific knowledge, plus one course with a laboratory in the basic or applied sciences.

##### **DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS**

- . 1) A laboratory course in the applied physical or biological sciences brings basic knowledge to bear on the solution of practical problems in engineering, medicine, agriculture, forestry, and other fields for which natural science forms the foundation. Normally applied science courses require one of the basic natural sciences (biology, physics, chemistry, geology) as a prerequisite, and carry at least 4 degree credits.
- . 2) A course in the applications of scientific knowledge has the following attributes:
  - . a) it focuses on one or more basic or applied natural sciences
  - . b) it includes significant blending of presently accepted science with its application in common situations;
  - . c) it discusses both the applications and limitations of the relevant scientific methodology;
  - . d) it includes as a major component of the course the observation of natural phenomena coupled with the gathering of data and its quantitative analysis, and its interpretation in an expository format;

its overall focus is on guiding students towards the scientific literacy necessary for modern life rather than on training future science professionals.

A science course, laboratory or applied, will have the following student outcomes embedded within the course. The outcomes are based on “The Nature of Science” as published in “Science for All Americans Online” at <http://www.project2061.org/publications/sfaa/online/chap1.htm> (sponsored by American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)). Retrieved February 2012.

**Student Learning Outcomes** Students completing the general education area of Science will be able to:

- . 1) Explain what makes knowledge scientific, i.e., “...things and events in the universe occur in consistent patterns that are comprehensible through careful, systematic study.” (AAAS)
- . 2) Demonstrate the appreciation that scientific knowledge is subject to change as new observations and interpretations challenge current understanding.
- . 3) Recognize that valid scientific information is durable, i.e., it is continually affirmed as new observations are made.
- . 4) Perform scientific inquiry including aspects of the scientific method, such as observation, hypothesis, experiment, and evaluation. *Note: Covered in laboratory science courses but not necessarily in applied science courses.*

#### **Resolution to adopt updated General Education Student Learning Outcomes for Capstone Experience**

Original statement from the General Education Implementation Guidelines for Capstone Experience (ratified by the Senate 1996). *Every program must include an approved capstone experience. The goal is to draw together the various threads of the undergraduate program that bear directly upon the academic major in an experience that typifies the work of professionals within the discipline. Normally, the Capstone would conclude at the end of the student's senior year. Students should consult closely with their academic advisor to explore the range of options available for meeting this requirement.*

*The capstone experience should have the following attributes:*

- . *the experience must be of significant depth and require innovation, creativity, reflection and synthesis of prior learning;*
- . *the experience must result in a thesis, report, presentation, or performance that demonstrates mastery of the subject matter*
- . *faculty/student interaction should be an integral part of the experience.*
- . *minimum student effort in the capstone should reflect the equivalent of three credits of work*

*Interdisciplinary experiences and opportunities for group participation in the capstone experience should be encouraged.*

The General Education Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt and ratify the following updated and streamlined set of student learning outcomes for the Capstone Experience general education category. This change creates student learning outcomes that are clear,

assessable, and understandable by students.

### **Proposed student learning outcomes and preamble: General Education Student Learning Outcomes**

Capstone

#### **Preamble**

*Every program must include an approved capstone experience. The goal is to draw together the various threads of the undergraduate program that bear directly upon the academic major in an experience that typifies the work of professionals within the discipline. Normally, the Capstone would conclude at the end of the student's senior year. Students should consult closely with their academic advisor to explore the range of options available for meeting this requirement.*

*The capstone experience should have the following attributes:*  
*1. the experience must be of significant depth and require innovation, creativity, reflection and synthesis of prior learning;*

GeEd Committee Reviewed Draft 2/24/12

- . *the experience must result in a thesis, report, presentation, or performance that demonstrates mastery of the subject matter*
- . *faculty/student interaction should be an integral part of the experience.*
- . *minimum student effort in the capstone should reflect the equivalent of three <sup>SEP</sup> credits of work*

*Interdisciplinary experiences and opportunities for group participation in the capstone experience should be encouraged.*

**Student Learning Outcomes** Students completing the general education area of Capstone Experience will be able to:

- . Synthesize knowledge, skills, and dispositions gained throughout the student's major concentration of study.
- . Demonstrate competence within the discipline through professional conduct and, as appropriate, critical reasoning, analytical ability, and creativity.
- . Demonstrate effective communication skills.

### **Resolution to adopt updated General Education Student Learning Outcomes for Human Values and Social Contexts: Cultural Diversity and International Perspectives**

Original statement from the General Education Implementation Guidelines for Cultural Diversity and International Perspectives (ratified by the Senate 1996). *A course included in the Cultural Diversity and International Perspectives category satisfies one or more of the following criteria: (a) it places primary emphasis on the experiences, perspectives, and cultural work of one or more groups who are not dominant within a particular culture; (b) it has a primary goal encouraging students to become aware of the diversity of American culture and to discover their roles within that diversity; or (c) it places primary emphasis on the relationships among or within different cultures in the past or present; (d) it introduces students to a culture other than their own through an intermediate or advanced course in the language of that culture.*

The General Education Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt and ratify the following updated and streamlined set of student learning outcomes for the Cultural Diversity and International Perspectives general education subcategory. This change creates student learning outcomes that are clear, assessable, and understandable by students.

#### **Proposed student learning outcomes and preamble:**

### **General Education Student Learning Outcomes<sup>SEP</sup> Human Values and Social Contexts: Cultural Diversity or International Perspectives**

#### **Preamble**

*A course included in the Cultural Diversity or International Perspectives category satisfies one or more of the following criteria: (a) it places primary emphasis on the experiences, perspectives, and cultural work of one or more groups who are not dominant within a particular culture; (b) it has a primary goal encouraging students to become aware of the diversity of American culture and to discover their roles within that diversity; or (c) it places primary emphasis on the relationships among or within different cultures in the past or present; (d) it introduces students to a culture other than their own through an intermediate or advanced course in the language of that culture.*

**Student Learning Outcomes** Students completing the Cultural Diversity or International Perspectives general education area of will be able to do at least one of the following:

Gen Ed Committee Reviewed 2/17/12

1. Recognize the experiences, perspectives, and cultural values of one or more groups who live within a culture different than their own.
2. Describe the diversity of American culture and reflect on their personal roles within that diversity.
3. Identify and assess how different cultures have related to each other either in the past or the present.
4. Achieve intermediate or advanced mastery of a language other than English.

## **Resolution to adopt updated General Education Student Learning Outcomes for Human Values and Social Contexts: Population and Environment**

Original statement from the General Education Implementation Guidelines for Population and Environment (ratified by the Senate 1996). *Courses included in the Population and Environment sub-category help students to understand how humankind interacts with our finite physical and biological environment. This understanding will be best achieved by a highly interdisciplinary approach that brings together aspects of the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. Although the technical solutions to environmental problems will be based upon scientific knowledge, the goals to be set and the ethical, political, economic and social dimensions of meeting them are the domain of the humanities and social sciences, which therefore must constitute a major focus of the course.*<sup>113</sup> Courses fulfilling this requirement should address the following:

- . a) the role of both local and global environmental change on the quality of human life;
- . b) the pervasive role of human population growth on environmental quality and the quality of life, both in industrial and developing countries;
- . c) the influence of cultural, religious, economic, educational, and political factors on population growth and environmental quality;
- . d) possible solutions to the population/environment problems, which may include the role of technological advancements, a reexamination of educational and political institutions, enlightened reassessment of traditional religious and economic conceptions, and rethinking of the contemporary Western conception of "the good life."

The General Education Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt and ratify the following updated and streamlined set of student learning outcomes for the Population and Environment general education subcategory. This change creates student learning outcomes that are clear, assessable, and understandable by students.

## **Resolution to adopt updated General Education Student Learning Outcomes for Human Values and Social Contexts: Artistic and Creative Expression**

Original statement from the General Education Implementation Guidelines for Artistic and Creative Expression (ratified by the Senate 1996). *Courses included in the Artistic and Creative Expression category engage the student in creative thinking and processes. A primary objective is to develop skills and intellectual tools required to make artistic and creative decisions, and to participate in, evaluate, or appreciate artistic and creative forms of expression.*

The General Education Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt and ratify the following updated and streamlined set of student learning outcomes for the Artistic and Creative Expression general education subcategory. This change creates student learning outcomes that are clear, assessable, and understandable by students.

### **Proposed student learning outcomes and preamble:**

#### **General Education Student Learning Outcomes<sup>113</sup> Human Values and Social Contexts: Artistic and Creative Expression**

##### **Preamble**

Courses included in the Artistic and Creative Expression category engage the student in creative thinking and processes. A primary objective is to develop skills and intellectual tools required to make artistic and creative decisions, and to participate in, evaluate, or appreciate artistic and creative forms of expression.

**Student Learning Outcomes** Students completing the general education area of Artistic and Creative Expression will be able to:

- . Participate in, identify or evaluate artistic and creative forms of expression.
- . Develop skills and/or intellectual tools central to the artistic and creative process or its critique.

## **Resolution to adopt updated General Education Student Learning Outcomes for Human Values and Social Contexts: Social Contexts and Institutions**

Original statement from the General Education Implementation Guidelines for Social Contexts and Institutions (ratified by the Senate 1996). *Courses included in the Social Contexts and Institutions category focus upon the ways in which social contexts shape and limit human institutions (defined broadly to include customs and relationships as well as organizations). The specific focus may be upon ways in which social contexts and institutions interact with human values, the role of institutions in expressing cultural values, or the social and ethical dimensions attendant upon particular academic disciplines.*

The General Education Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt and ratify the following updated and streamlined set of student learning outcomes for the Social Contexts and Institutions general education subcategory. This change creates student learning outcomes that are clear, assessable, and understandable by students.

### **Proposed student learning outcomes and preamble:**

#### **General Education Student Learning Outcomes<sup>113</sup> Human Values and Social Contexts: Social Contexts and Institutions**

##### **Preamble**

Courses included in the Social Contexts and Institutions category focus upon the ways in which social contexts shape and limit human institutions (defined broadly to include customs and relationships as well as organizations). The specific focus may be upon ways in which social contexts and

institutions interact with human values, the role of institutions in expressing cultural values, or the social and ethical dimensions attendant upon particular academic disciplines.

**Student Learning Outcomes** Students completing the general education area of Social Context and Institutions will be able to:

- Identify, describe and analyze social contexts and human institutions
- Recognize and critically evaluate the interaction between social contexts and human institutions

**Vote: Approved 21, No 0, Abstain 0**

#### **PCRRC Assessment and Recommendation**

#### **Elimination Proposal: M.S. in Accounting**

April 2012

Background and Committee Process: [for Stage 2 sequence]

2009-2011: MSA Program transformed into a concentration in the MBA program

May 2011: Proposal tabled for completion in 2012-2013

3/12/12: Final Report: Program Elimination Proposal: Master of Science in Accounting (MSA) – Dean Ivan Manev, School of Business

4/4/12: PCRRC meeting to draft final recommendation to Faculty Senate

Overview of the Proposal and Current Status of the Transformation to a Concentration:

\* It clearly outlines the transformation rather than the elimination of a program. With the approval of the full MBS faculty, the former MSA program has already been transformed into a concentration in the MBA program at the University of Maine.

\* It makes a compelling case for the reasons why the former MSA program did not meet its original expectations after about 10 years of operation. In addition, it explains the AACSB accreditation issues that would be encountered if a MS program were to continue with the current number of accounting faculty.

\* It indicates that the transformation has had minimal impact on the cost of instruction, research, and public service. Moreover, no faculty were retrenched or reassigned during the restructuring. Finally, the restructuring from a MS to a concentration does not negatively impact the mission of the University of Maine's Business School.

PCRRC Summary Comments:

The PCRRC carefully reviewed the Program Elimination Proposal: Master of Science in Accounting (MSA). In addition it considered the transformation of the MSA program into a concentration over the past several years. It finds that, given the changing circumstances of academic requirements and expectations of graduate study leading to a Certified Public Accountant exam, the Business School has effectively and thoughtfully completed the transformation with a minimum of disruption for both students and faculty.

Recommendation

PCRRC recommends Faculty Senate approval of the elimination of the MS in Accounting.

**Vote: Approved 21, No 0, Abstain 0**

#### **Academic Affairs Motion**

**Subject: Academic policy: grading system wording changes.**

From: The Academic Affairs Committee To: Faculty Senate Date: April 25, 2012

Attached please find a revised version of the grading system wording (being proposed), and a copy showing the edits. This text will be a part of the undergraduate catalog.

**Rationale, from the office of student records, is as follows: Rationale for Editorial Changes to Descriptions of Grades in the Undergraduate Catalog (F, L, LP, P, T, W, and addition to I)**

#### **New Language in "Incomplete" Policy**

Changes to the Incomplete ("I") grade description are designed to clarify arrangements in the event the instructor is not able to work with the student to evaluate outstanding work turned in by his or her deadline(s) and to coordinate with changes on the Incomplete Reporting Form. The form and the policy have always assumed that instructors understand that student's consent and knowledge is necessary to assign this grade. But new instructors may not always understand that. Without such a provision, instructors might assign Incompletes to students called to active duty in the following semester without the student realizing he or she had an Incomplete grade. Such a student who had earned a low passing grade and was content with the credit might eventually have an "F" and no credit on the transcript, when an Incomplete of which he or she was unaware changes to an "F" after 140 days.

#### **New Definitions for "L" and "F"**

The distinction between the "L" and "F" grades is extremely significant in terms of financial aid eligibility: past inconsistency in the awarding of these two grades has meant that some students had semester financial aid revoked when others did not lose their aid, even though their behavior and achievement was the same. The changes in the definitions of these two grades are designed to make it easier for instructors to know which grade is appropriate and to align with standards of federal financial aid distribution that our Student Financial Aid Office is legally obliged to uphold. The former standard for the grade of "L" of "Never attended or stopped attending" gave no specifics about when the attendance stopped, and many instructors complained that it was hard to know what it really meant. The percentage suggested in the new language, we hope, will make it easy for faculty to know which of the two grades is most appropriate to assign.

In addition, it is important when students seek academic and/or financial adjustments due to involuntary circumstances (such as medical problems) that the grade aligns with attendance/participation in the course as accurately as possible. If not, deans' offices have to bother faculty members to check attendance records and verify a student's account of absences or missed work, and this is unnecessary if an "L" is given to a student who disappeared from the class early on.

#### **Discussion:**

The changes can be grouped into three areas:

- Organizational. The descriptions of L through W, currently at the bottom of the discussion, have been moved up to be with all the other grade descriptions.
- Clarification. New instructors, especially, will benefit from more detailed instructions about the assigning of incompletes.
- To conform to federal financial aid regulation. This is clearly the most important. In the past, it was not clear when an L was appropriate and when an F is appropriate for a student who fails to complete a course, and this can affect financial aid. The new wording introduces a 50% participation rule (to be determined by the instructor.) "If participation is 50% or more, the F grade is appropriate." Less than 50% participation, then L is appropriate. This conforms to federal financial aid guidelines. ¶¶The issue Financial Aid faces is in determining if a student walked away and didn't finish a class. Apparently this is important only in the aggregate. That is, if a student got a grade in ANY class (even an F) they do not need to do any more work. The distinction between L and F doesn't matter to them. But what they see sometimes is that a student gets 3 Fs and 2 Ls. Now they have to check and see if those Fs are Fs or should be Ls. If they walked away from everything then there are ramifications regarding financial aid.

The committee has worked extensively on this wording with Financial Aid and Academic Affairs and believes the revised text is appropriate.

The Faculty Senate approves the language following for the Undergraduate Catalog.

**Vote: Approved 21, No 0, Abstain 0**

**Subject: Academic Policy: No Examination in the Final Week of Classes From: The Academic Affairs Committee¶¶To: Faculty Senate¶¶Date: April 25, 2012**

#### **Discussion:**

Current Policy (approved on May 17, 1995 Faculty Senate Meeting):

No examination may be scheduled during the last week of classes except by permission of the appropriate associate dean or director. A final examination may be scheduled only during final exam week. If a final is not scheduled, and the instructor wishes to schedule a prelim covering the last weeks of the course, this prelim must be given during the final exam week.

The Academic Affairs Committee understands that the intent behind the policy is to reduce student stress, to allow sufficient study time prior to final exams, and to preserve full length of the semester. The Committee fully supports such intent. However, the Committee also recognizes that for pedagogical reasons, instructors may at times wish to give tests during the final week of the classes and thus request permission for an exception. For example, some laboratory courses may fall into such category. The current policy states that only an associate dean or director may grant such exceptions. In some colleges and units, associate deans or directors may not be familiar with faculty members making waiver requests or familiar with instructors' pedagogical reasons. In such cases, the Academic Affairs Committee believes that the unit curriculum committee or faculty equivalent may be the best judge in making such decisions. However, the Committee also recognizes the importance of communicating the decision to grant a waiver to the appropriate associate dean or director to ensure implementation. The Academic Affairs Committee therefore suggests the current policy to be amended as stated in the language below.

The Faculty Senate approves the proposed "no examination in the final week of classes" policy.

A final examination may be scheduled only during final exam week. If a final exam is not scheduled, and the instructor wishes to schedule a prelim covering the last weeks of the course, this prelim must be given during the final exam week. No examination may be scheduled during the last week of classes unless permission is granted by the department, area, or unit curriculum committee or faculty equivalent. Scheduling decisions should be made within a framework that preserves the full length of the semester and considers the impact of such examinations on the students involved. For information purposes, this decision will be communicated by the unit to the college Associate Dean, whose responsibility is in turn to communicate with the Office of Student Records.

**Vote: Approved 21, No 0, Abstain 0**

## **2010 – 2011 Motions**



## September 23, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

**MOTION TITLE:** Reauthorization of Maine Day

**MOTION BY:** Academic Affairs Committee

**MOTION:**

**Introduction:**

The tradition of Maine Day began in 1935, when then President Arthur Hauck designated a day for the students, faculty, and staff to work together in cleaning up the campus. Every four years, the Faculty Senate is required to re-authorize the institution of Maine Day.

**Motion:**

The Faculty Senate re-authorizes Maine Day for the years 2011-2015. Maine Day will occur on the Wednesday of the last week of classes in the Spring Semester. Classes will be canceled on that day with the exception of classes, including laboratories, which meet two or fewer times per week. Within 30 days after Maine Day, the group that has overall responsibility for organizing the event shall submit to the Senate a list of projects that were accomplished and the number of people who participated. The Faculty Senate will reconsider the policy of Maine Day in the Fall of 2014.

**VOTING RESULTS:** The motion passed: 24 for, 1 against, and 0 abstentions.

**MOTION TITLE:** Role and Scope of the University of Maine

**MOTION BY:** Senate Executive Committee

**MOTION:** Role and Scope Resolution

The University of Maine

The University of Maine is a nationally competitive Land Grant and Sea Grant university with a broad array of baccalaureate through doctoral offerings. Scholarship in the pursuit of new knowledge, education of undergraduate and graduate students, and outreach services to the state are central to the role of the University of Maine as the state's major research University.

**Public Agenda:**

The University of Maine is committed to serving the needs of the state, nation and world in times of increasingly rapid changes in society and the natural environment. The faculty and staff are dedicated to working with varied and diverse constituencies in the State to foster social, economic, and cultural development as a means of improving the quality of life in Maine, the Nation, and the World.

**Teaching:**

The University of Maine faculty stay on the cutting edge of cultural and technological changes. Academic services, resources, and teaching are delivered statewide. A strong liberal education provides the foundation for all students, undergraduate and graduate, in the sciences, arts and humanities, and professions.

**Research and Scholarship:**

Internationally-recognized research, scholarship, and creative activity distinguish the University of Maine as the state's flagship university, where faculty and students contribute knowledge to issues of local, national, and international significance. Research, scholarship, teaching, and outreach are linked in the classroom and laboratories, in projects, and in the culture of the university, and are the basis of the Land Grant mission, at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

**Outreach:**

The University of Maine faculty and students provide comprehensive outreach to the State of Maine and worldwide with public service and multiple forms of education to the citizens of Maine and beyond. The university's service to Maine provides underpinnings for business, industry, nonprofit organizations, community associations, and governmental agencies, to address the needs of contemporary society. Our outreach fosters vital economic engines and expands our global involvement in the sciences, arts, and professions.

There was a friendly amendment to add the words "and staff" in the second paragraph, second line, after "The faculty..." which was approved.

**VOTING RESULTS:** The resolution was approved: 21 for, 1 against, and 1 abstention.

## October 20, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

**MOTION TITLE:** Assignment of Program Suspension Reviews to the Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee

**MOTION BY:** <who?>

**MOTION:** As the representative body of the University of Maine Faculty empowered to oversee "the establishment and elimination of academic programs" (Constitution of the University of Maine Faculty Senate, Article III, Section 3), the Faculty Senate designates the Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee as the committee appropriate to fulfilling the University of Maine System guidelines for program suspensions (Section 305.4, Paragraph 2g) to review all proposed academic program suspensions, hold public discussions on these proposed suspensions, and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate. The Senate will then send any resulting motion to the University of Maine Provost and President for inclusion with the Administration's recommendation to the UMS Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

**VOTING RESULTS:** The motion passed: 19 for, none against, no abstentions.

## November 17, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

**MOTION TITLE:** Amendments to the Constitution and the Bylaws

**MOTION BY:** Constitution & Bylaws Committee:

**MOTION:** The C&BL Committee and the Executive Committee recommend the following corrections and changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws.

**Constitution:**

1. Article III, section 6: change "Faculty Assembly" to "Faculty Senate"
2. Article IV: paragraph C, section 3: change "Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies" to "Vice President for Research".
3. Article VI, section 4: "Agenda", paragraph B: change the wording so that it reads:  
"The Secretary shall distribute the agenda at least 72 hours prior to each regular meeting."

**Bylaws:**

1. Article II: Committee Membership: omit the sentence: "Except in unusual circumstances, a faculty member may serve concurrently on only one standing committee."

Commentary: If this Bylaw requirement were strictly followed, the Senate could not function, nor is it possible, arithmetically, to fulfill this requirement because the number of standing committees now exceeds the capacity of the colleges' distribution of Senators to enable each committee to have representatives from each college, while having each Senator serve on only one committee. The Executive Committee and C&BL Committee reviewed this issue and unanimously recommend the above action.

2. Article IV., Section 8, paragraph B: correct "Committee on Program Creation, Review and Reorganization" to read "Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee".

3. Article V.: replace "Center of Teaching Excellence" with "CETA (Center for Excellence in Teaching and Assessment)"

4. Article IV. STANDING COMMITTEES, "paragraph B: Membership" : Two corrections are needed in this paragraph:

(1) lines 4/5: present wording "Program Creation, Review, and Reorganization" should be changed to "Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee";

(2) in the list of standing committees whose chairs are entitled to Executive Committee membership, the General Education Committee should be listed. It should be listed immediately prior to "Parliamentarian."

5. Article V. SPECIAL COMMITTEES: Section 1 of the Bylaws currently indicates the existence of an "AD HOC GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE ...." . This is now incorrect, because the General Education Committee was changed to a Standing Committee (see Faculty Senate minutes, March 31, 2010). The following three corrections thus need to be made to the Bylaws, to correctly designate the General Education Committee as a standing committee, and re-numbering the concluding Articles:

a. move the content of present Article V. Section 1. to Article IV, Section 11: General Education Committee.

b. the present content of Article VI., "Other Ad Hoc Committees may be created for time limited periods as voted on by the full Senate", should be moved to Article V. SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

c. the present content of Article VII., "AMENDMENT .....", should be moved to Article VI. There will now, thus, be no "Article VII"

**VOTING RESULTS:** The motion passed 34 in favor, none against, no abstentions. Bylaws were enacted.

NOTE: The Constitution amendments were NOT confirmed in a timely manner by campus-wide referendum and thus the changes were not enacted at this time.

### December 15, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

– no motions made

### January 26, 2011 Faculty Senate Meeting

**MOTION TITLE:** A Resolution affirming the student learning outcomes for the General Education category of Quantitative Literacy

**MOTION BY:** General Education Committee

**MOTION:** General Education represents a cross-college set of requirements for successful completion of any undergraduate major at the University of Maine. As such, oversight of the general Education curriculum, by designated categories, falls within the purview of the Faculty Senate.

The NEASC action letter of November 2009 mandates assessment results for General Education, with two interim reports, in 2012 and 2014, showing movement toward this goal. In order to accomplish this, the establishment of assessment criteria for each General Education category, based upon Student Learning Outcomes for each category, is an essential first step. Since the faculty has not reviewed the Student Learning Outcomes for each category since the inception of General Education in 1994 and 1996, the Faculty Senate, through the General Education Committee has commenced this first step.

A group of faculty have reviewed and made recommendations for the Student Learning Outcomes for Quantitative Literacy, which has been expanded to more clearly address the integration of the use of computers and computational mathematics in many areas, which was nascent when the general education category of mathematics was first configured. This process is in keeping with the iterative policy used to assure faculty ownership of General Education.

Resolution: The Faculty Senate, in keeping with its responsibility for oversight of General Education, hereby accepts the following Student Learning Outcomes for the General Education category, Quantitative Literacy (Mathematics).

General Education Student Learning Outcomes – Quantitative Literacy Preamble

Quantitative literacy is the ability to formulate, evaluate, and communicate conclusions and inferences from quantitative information. Students will develop their quantitative literacy during their undergraduate experience through courses targeted at quantitative literacy and through frequent exposure to quantitative problems and analyses both inside and outside their major.

Student Learning Outcomes Upon completion of general education study in quantitative literacy, students will understand the role that mathematics and quantitative thinking plays in solving and communicating information about real world problems and relationships. Students will be able to:

1. Translate problems from everyday spoken and written language to appropriate quantitative questions.

2. Interpret quantitative information from formulas, graphs, tables, schematics, simulations, and visualizations, and draw inferences from that information.

3. Solve problems using arithmetical, algebraic, geometrical, statistical, or computational methods.

4. Analyze answers to quantitative problems in order to determine reasonableness. Suggest alternative approaches if necessary.

5. Represent quantitative information symbolically, visually, and numerically.

6. Present quantitative results in context using everyday spoken and written language as well as using formulas, graphs, tables, schematics, simulations, and visualizations.

Instructors of courses offering General Education credit in the area of Quantitative Literacy will indicate how the Student Learning Outcomes will be achieved on their syllabi. Assessment practices are, for the most part, embedded within the courses awarding general education credit and are appropriate to the content and goals of each course and program.

**VOTING RESULTS:** The motion passed 34 in favor, none against, no abstentions.

## February 23, 2011 Faculty Senate Meeting

– forthcoming

## March 30, 2011 Faculty Senate Meeting

– forthcoming

## April 27, 2011 Faculty Senate Meeting

– forthcoming

[President Kennedy Response to April 27 Motions](#)

## 2009 – 2010 Motions

### September 23, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting

**MOTION TITLE:** Proposed Change to the Constitution of the Faculty Senate

**MOTION BY:** Constitution and Bylaws Committee

**MOTION:** (The 60 day period having been observed, this is the final senate vote on the changes to the Constitution and Bylaws.)

#### Old Version

Section 1. Officers. At a meeting in April of each year, the Senate shall elect, from among the faculty members, the following two officers for a term of one year: Vice President/President-elect, and Secretary. Any tenure-track or continuing appointment faculty member, who has been on the University of Maine faculty for at least two years, is eligible for election to these offices. Newly elected officers shall begin their duties on July 1 following their election.

Section 2. Succession of officers. The Vice President/President-elect shall succeed to the office of President. The President and Vice President/President-elect may not succeed to the same office but the Secretary may succeed to the same office.

#### NEW Version

Section 1. Officers. At a meeting in April of each year, the Senate shall elect, from among the faculty members, the following three officers for a term of one year: President, Vice President, and Secretary. Any tenure-track or continuing appointment faculty member, who has been on the University of Maine faculty for at least two years, is eligible for election to these offices. Newly elected officers shall begin their duties on July 1 following their election.

Section 2. Term limits. The President and Vice President may not serve more than two consecutive terms in the same office.

Proposed Change to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate

#### Old Version

ARTICLE I. ELECTION OF SENATE OFFICERS At the March meeting, the Committee on Committees shall present candidates for Vice President/President-elect, at least one candidate for Secretary and Board of Trustees Representative and at least one candidate for each position on the committee on Committees. The agenda for the April meeting shall include the names of those nominated. There shall be an opportunity for nominations from the floor at the time of the election in April. Each office shall be voted on separately by secret ballot, where there is a contest, and a majority of the votes cast shall be necessary for election. In the event that no candidate receives a majority, a second vote shall be taken between the two highest candidates. In the event the Vice President's office becomes vacant prior to the expiration of the term, the Senate shall hold a special election. At a regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate, the President shall inform the members of the vacancy, ask the Committee on Committees to secure nominations, and set the time for the election at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the full Senate. At the time of election, the procedure shall be as outlined in the paragraph- above. In the event the Secretary's office becomes vacant prior to the expiration of the term, the President shall in consultation with the Executive Committee, appoint a replacement to serve the remainder of the term.

#### NEW Version

ARTICLE I. ELECTION OF SENATE OFFICERS At the March meeting, the Committee on Committees shall present candidates for President, Vice President, Secretary, and Board of Trustees Representative and at least one candidate for each position on the committee on Committees. The agenda for the April meeting shall include the names of those nominated. . . . In the event the President's office become vacant prior to the expiration of the term, the Vice President automatically becomes President of the Faculty Senate. In the event the Vice President's office becomes vacant prior to the expiration of the term, the Senate shall hold a special election.

**VOTING RESULTS:** The motion passed. The vote was:

Favor: 24

Against: 1

In Absentia: 2

### October 21, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting

– no motions made

### November 18, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting

– no motions made

### December 12, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting

**MOTION TITLE:** PCRRC response to the new BA/BS in Climate Change and Culture

**MOTION BY:**

**MOTION:**

Dr. Onsrud reported that this is the first time the PCRRC has looked at a proposal for a new program. The committee decided not to hold a campus meeting but would offer constructive questions to inform the program's intent to plan. The committee's recommendation is not to object to the intent to plan but to offer constructive feedback.

Dr. Kris Sobolik spoke on behalf of the proposed new degree. She explained that this is a new program involving a human and scientific approach to climate change. It is interdisciplinary, draws on existing faculty, and uses no new resources. It is unique – there is no other program on campus like it.

Dr. Belknap noted that he felt the PCRRC process was flawed in that the proposing unit could have answered questions directly had it been included as part of the process. The comments directed to the proposal seemed to be overly negative.

Dr. Onsrud said that the committee expected detailed and comprehensive documentation and that it appeared there was a rush to move this proposal forward. For instance the proposal states that the program will attract students from out-of-state, but where is the evidence that it will? Clearly this is a compelling area for a degree but we want the PCRRC process to be taken seriously. Recall that this committee recommends to the full senate and that the senate can make whatever recommendation it wants.

Dr. Sobolik noted that it did not feel rushed to those involved in formulating the proposal.

Dr. Grillo said that though he supports this particular program proposal, the PCRRC process must be taken seriously because we don't want to put new unneeded programs up at a time of budget shortfalls.

Dr. Killam noted that she is on the PCRRC and the committee was supportive of the plan and that the committee's intent was to signal some areas for further development and that there was no sense that the proposal should be scuttled.

Dr. Kornfield noted that saying it is cost neutral is probably incorrect if enrollments go up.

Dr. Sobolik said that the units do have quite a lot of room, but maybe some supply costs will increase.

**VOTING RESULTS:**

Yes: 20

No: 0

Abstain: 3

Motion to move the report forward with Senate support for this proposal:

Yes: 23

**January 27, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**MOTION TITLE:** Amendment to the Proposed Role and Scope Statement

**MOTION BY:** <who?>

**MOTION:** The Role and Scope statement was discussed and a friendly amendment was suggested to add the words “undergraduate and graduate” after the phrase, “foundation for all students.”

**VOTING RESULTS:** Vote on the friendly amendment:

Accept: 17

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 1

**MOTION TITLE:** Approval of a Role and Scope Statement for the University of Maine

**MOTION BY:** <who?>

**MOTION:** .... INSERT HERE THE ROLE AND SCOPE STATEMENT INCORPORATING THE AMENDMENT

**VOTING RESULTS:** Vote to accept the role and scope statement as amended:

Accept: 17

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 1

**MOTION TITLE:** Recommendation regarding the Smoke-Free Campus

**MOTION BY:** Environment Committee

**MOTION:** .....INSERT HERE ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

The Senate voted on accepting the Environment Committee's recommendation to delay the initiative until there is further discussion of the consequences of such a policy in a wider forum.

**VOTING RESULTS:** The vote was:

Vote to accept Environment Committee's recommendation:

Accept: 16

Opposed: 1

Abstentions: 1

**February 24, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**MOTION TITLE:** ????

**MOTION BY:** Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee

**MOTION:** The PCRRC recommends and moves that this letter and its attachment be forwarded to the administration for its consideration in assessing the merits of the proposal.

.... INSERT OR LINK HERE THE LETTER AND ATTACHMENT

**VOTING RESULTS:** The vote on the motion was:

Approve: 24

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

**MOTION TITLE:** Create an Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Assessment of University of Maine Educational Technology Mission and Supporting Infrastructure.

**MOTION BY:** Irv Kornfield SECOND BY:

**MOTION:** Preamble: Technology is vital to the educational and instructional mission of the University of Maine. The role of technology in education is rapidly evolving with regard to the development of educational tools and delivery systems for traditional classes and those using distance-ed modalities. The availability of technology and students' expectations concerning the integration of technology into all aspects of their learning experience has increased greatly in the last five years. Further, The University of Maine System has expressed the need to expand distance-educational opportunities while simultaneously mandating resource conservation and consolidation. The University of Maine System has proposed the consolidation of academic and administrative IT Services throughout all campuses to a Hybrid IT Model. It is critical to define a strategic vision for utilization of extant and emerging technologies to support the teaching mission of the University.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine will create a new Ad Hoc Committee, titled Faculty Assessment of the University of Maine Educational Technology Mission and Supporting Infrastructure Ad hoc Committee.

This committee will define a strategic vision for educational technology at the University of Maine. They will consider technology and infrastructure for creation, support and delivery of offerings on-campus and on-line. The committee will meet with various campus groups to acquire a full and unbiased assessment of the educational technology needs, resources, and support at the University.

The committee will explore and form recommendations for best uses of technology resources supporting the institutional vision while identifying cost-saving measures whenever possible.

The committee will produce a report concerning current and future utilization of technology in the academic arena for both classroom and distance education, including issues relevant to faculty support and development serving the educational mission of University of Maine. The committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the full Faculty Senate and to the President of the University of Maine.

Membership: The committee membership will consist of no more than ten faculty members. The chair of this committee shall be appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate and shall be a member of the Faculty Senate. Additional faculty members from Faculty Senate and at large shall be added to ensure that each College, including the Honors College and Co-operative Extension, is represented. Outside members with expertise in the use of technology will be invited to participate along with the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence.

The hybrid model provides an opportunity for each campus IT organization to develop IT plans and strategies to support the mission and goals of their campus, while taking advantage of consolidated shared services and collaborative efforts that strengthen the overall system-wide delivery of services to end users. This model is designed to take advantage of the best features of centralized and decentralized approaches.

**VOTING RESULTS:** The vote on the motion was:

Approve: 23

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

**MOTION TITLE:** Support of General Education Assessment as Outlined by the General Education Committee

**MOTION BY:** Ad Hoc General Education Committee

**MOTION:** The Faculty Senate accepts and endorses the process of General Education Assessment outlined in the accompanying document put forward by the General Education Committee. <>The attached process and timeline are constructed to bring the University of Maine into compliance with the NEASC Action letter, dated November 17, 2009, which sets specific dates for progress to be reported illustrating our success in implementing a comprehensive approach to the assessment of student learning in 2012 and 2014.

**VOTING RESULTS:** The vote on the motion was:

Approve: 24

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

### March 31, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

**MOTION TITLE:** Establish the General Education Committee as a Standing Committee

**MOTION BY:** <who?>

**MOTION:** Establish the General Education Committee as a standing committee.

Vote:

Approve: 15

Oppose: 0

Abstain: 0

**MOTION TITLE:** Nominations of SENATE Officers

**MOTION BY:** <who?> SECOND BY: ???

**MOTION:** Nominations for Senate Officers:

Board of Trustees Representative: Bob Rice

President Elect: Jim Warhola

Secretary: Judy Kuhns-Hastings

### April 28, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

– no motions

### May 26, 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting

**MOTION TITLE:** Establish the General Education Committee as a Standing Committee

**MOTION BY:** Ad Hoc General Education Committee

**MOTION:** Motion to Establish the General Education Committee as a Standing Committee

31 March, & 6 May, 2010

**Introduction:**

On 22 October, 2008, the Faculty Senate established an Ad Hoc Committee on General Education, as our current By-Laws reflect. The motion stated:

The Senate will create an Ad Hoc Committee on General Education. This committee will be made up of a chair, who is a Senate Member and appointed by the President of the Senate, and at least five committee members, representing each College. At least half of the faculty membership of the committee must be members of the Faculty Senate. Further, the chair of the Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee (or his/her designee) will automatically serve as an ad hoc member of this committee.

During the 2009-2010 academic year, the establishment of this committee will be reviewed for possible recommendation as a standing committee. Since then, General Education issues have become even more significant, as we need address the recommendations of NEASC, which focus on outcomes assessment for General Education, and also as the Administration proposes that we consider changes to how we structure our General Education curriculum. Given that these issues will take time to work through, that the curriculum will need long-term monitoring for assessing its effectiveness, and that further issues will most likely arise as the University of Maine continues to address its programmatic needs, the Constitution and By-Laws Committee, in consultation with the Ad Hoc General Education Committee and Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee recommend the proposed motion below.

Turning the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education to a standing committee entails amending the Senate By-Laws. They state in Article VII, Amendment:

These bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the Senate Faculty Members present and voting, provided that the proposed amendment has been submitted to the Secretary of the Senate at least forty-five days prior to the vote on the proposed amendment. Upon receipt of the proposed amendment, the Secretary shall forward it to the Chairperson of the Committee on Constitution and Bylaw. The Secretary shall then notify the members of the Senate in the next regular meeting printed agenda that such a proposal has been received and forwarded to the Committee on Constitution and Bylaws in conformance with this section of the bylaws. This committee shall review the proposed amendment and make recommendations. The proposed amendment and the action of the Committee on Constitution and Bylaws shall be distributed by the Secretary to the membership of the Senate at least fifteen days prior to the meeting at which action is to be taken.

At this point, the required steps have proceeded properly, so at the 26 May, 2010 meeting, the By-Laws and Constitution Committee asks the Senate to consider passing:

**Motion:**

The Faculty Senate will convert the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education to a Standing Committee of the Senate, continuing with its current structure, namely, lead by a Chair, who is a Senate Member and appointed by the President of the Senate, and at least five committee members, representing each College. At least half of the faculty membership of the committee must be members of the Faculty Senate. Further, the chair of the Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee (or his/her designee) will automatically serve as an ad hoc member of this committee.

**VOTING RESULTS:** The motion passed.

**MOTION TITLE:** Transcript Evaluation Policy

**MOTION BY:** Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee

**MOTION:** Resolution regarding revision of the current Transcript Evaluation policy, including “academic forgiveness” and “fresh start” policies

**Rationale:**

The University of Maine’s policy on transcript reevaluation has undergone several revisions over the course of its existence. It is far more liberal than current policies at peer institutions. Within the university itself, ambiguous text has led to varying interpretations, resulting in more and less restrictive options for students in the five degree granting colleges. Of greatest concern are the unintended academic and financial consequences created by a policy that forgives selectively across an unlimited number of semesters and without regard to subsequent academic performance. For all of these reasons we recommend moving toward a more restrictive policy, and providing implementation guidelines to facilitate a common interpretation across all administrative units. This recommendation assumes relative ease of movement within the five degree granting colleges, if only as an undeclared major under a clearly articulated contract. Unless this assumption holds, the new policy will exacerbate an already existing problem.

**Motion:**

The Faculty Senate moves acceptance of the revision of the TRANSCRIPT EVALUATION policy, including “academic forgiveness” and “fresh start” policies, as reviewed by the Academic Affairs committee and vetted thoroughly by the pertinent units of the Administration. We further move acceptance of the catalogue language included with the motion.

**Resolution:**

The Faculty Senate resolves that the recommendation of the transcript evaluation policy currently in effect at the University of Maine and the accompanying catalogue language be accepted as policy, effective AY 2010-2011.

**Revised CATALOG WORDING:**

The University of Maine has two separate and distinct policies governing when and under what circumstances a transcript may be reevaluated. Each policy is described below.

**Academic Forgiveness**

Academic forgiveness refers to the exclusion of an entire fall or spring semester from the calculation of a student’s grade point average and earned credits. All grades remain on the transcript. When academic forgiveness occurs, the associate dean or designee may waive the re-taking of selected courses for which the student has earned sufficient grades. Though the degree credit has been removed, these courses may be used to meet degree requirements and to meet pre-requisite requirements. Students must achieve program minimum requirements to graduate.

**VOTING RESULTS:** The motion passed.

## 2008 – 2009 Motions

### September 24, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting

**Motion Title:** Motion to Establish Faculty Senate Goals for 2008-2009



The faculty of the University of Maine engages in university governance through the Faculty Senate, which is the official governance body of the faculty. As such, it is important for the Senate to work toward goals that move the institution forward and address critical issues as they emerge.

## **Motion**

The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine endorses the following goals for the 2008-2009 academic year and encourages each committee to proceed with all due speed to accomplish these goals, while remaining nimble and able to adjust or react as needed.

### **Academic Affairs Chair – Dr. Daniel Belknap**

- Investigate University admission standards and how they are being applied.
- Establish the process for, as well as the rate and occurrences of, faculty attrition, relocation, and strategic planning related to faculty positions, especially in light of rising enrollment
- Establish a process for resolving inter-college disagreements related to joint programs and shared classes
- Make recommendations for equitable compensation of faculty supervising student enrollment, such as thesis writing and independent study credits
- Continue the analysis of General Education requirements (which may fall to a subcommittee)

### **Committees on Committees Chair – Dr. Shihfen Tu**

- Establish which committees of the administration have (or should have) liaisons from the Senate
- Ensure the administration informs the Senate about the final make-up of committees (and that this gets posted on the administration website)

### **Constitution and Bylaws Chair – Dr. Judy Kuhns-Hastings**

- Review the Constitution and Bylaws for any inaccuracies, inconsistencies, or omissions, and suggest necessary revisions

### **Environment Chair – Dr. Stephanie Welcomer**

- Investigate the status of climate issues on campus
- Review the energy audit, which is finished (or nearly finished)
- Be a liaison to the committee investigating the feasibility of better commuter bus service
- Select a —greenll goal appropriate for the Senate and then lead this effort
- Investigate the impact of a M/W, T/Th class schedule

### **Finance Committee Co-Chairs – Dr. Sue Estler, Dr. Bill Halteman**

- Work with the administration to develop an annual fiscal report
- Investigate the status of Coke contract and use of funds
- Ask to see and then review the Board of Trustees' quarterly financial reports for decisions that have an impact on this campus
- Get answers to the questions posed last year about the timing and kind of gifts coming in with the capital campaign, how priorities are being set for this money, the hidden —costsll of gifts (e.g. the athletic bubble), and the apparent emphasis on expenditures for the president's garden, Carnegie Hall, etc.

### **Library Chair – Dr. Harlan Onsrud**

- Make significant steps toward establishing an Institutional Repository
- Investigate the status of library support in light of increased tuition, increased enrollment, capital campaign efforts, and additional research support for external sources
- Continue to explore ways to improve holdings in scholarly data bases

### **PCRRC Chair – Dr. James Warhola**

- Investigate the status and impact of collaboration, such as with the Vermont Medical School and Husson Pharmacy Program
- Revise Protocols based on past experiences – clarify what falls under PCRRC
- Make recommendations about the scope of this committee in reviewing and making recommendations for program creation

### **Research Chair – Dr. Touradj Solouki**

- Investigate additional site licenses for research programs (e.g. SPSS) and databases
- Make recommendations for further institutional support for research and grant writing

### **Service and Outreach Chair – Dr. Michael Grillo**

- Establish interdisciplinary guidelines – Across campus, online, and cross-campus
- Work with Academic Affairs on a [process for resolving cross-college and cross-institution conflicts

### **Shared Governance Co-Chairs – Dr. Robert Rice, Dr. Dianne Hoff**

- Finish draft of the document of understanding about shared governance on this campus
- Work w/Task Force to complete an agreement between the faculty and administration

- Create a Faculty Handbook

#### Executive Committee Projects

- Conduct a University Environment survey, modeled after the one used by the Chronicle of Higher Education
- Develop a process for administrative evaluations
- Continue archiving policies and motions

**Voting Result:** The motion passed.

#### October 22, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting

**Motion Title:** Elimination of Paper Versions of Some Online Journals Available through Fogler Library

**Motion By:** Library Advisory Committee Motion

September 22, 2008

1. Fogler Library is proposing to go “online only” for many journal subscriptions. That is, paper subscriptions for many journals will now be dropped. Why is this being proposed?

- New publisher pricing models have online format as base subscription, with print format available as a second subscription or added expense
- Lack of sufficient space for bound journals in the library buildings
- Elimination of print format by growing numbers of publishers
- Publisher package licenses that add requested journals but require switch to online format

2. What guarantees do we as faculty and students have that we will have electronic access to back issues if the University drops its electronic subscriptions to particular journals?

- License agreements with publishers provide for post-cancellation access to subscribed content via publisher websites (Fogler Library has already successfully utilized such license agreements)
- Portico, provides post-cancellation access to subscribed content from publishers who have paid Portico to fulfill this function. Portico is a non-profit organization supported by
- The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, Ithaka, The Library of Congress, and JSTOR whose mission is the long-term preservation of scholarly literature published in electronic form. Portico has nearly 500 academic and research library members.

3. If Fogler Library no longer subscribes to an electronic journal and we want to view an online issue to which Fogler did subscribe, will we be able to do this seamlessly through URSUS from a campus office?

- Yes

4. What happens if Portico ceases to operate?

- Portico agreements with publishers specify that Portico would assign their rights and their content to another appropriate not-for-profit institution, in the unlikely event Portico should cease to operate: [http://www.portico.org/about/part\\_publishers.html](http://www.portico.org/about/part_publishers.html)
- Hundreds of institutions of higher education around the world have chosen Portico as their “insurance policy” to make sure they will not lose access to their e-journals, even if they discard their print: [http://www.portico.org/about/participating\\_libraries.html](http://www.portico.org/about/participating_libraries.html)

5. What is the extent of current usage of the hard copy (paper) versions that would be eliminated?

- Usage of hard copy academic journals for which we also have online access is low (e.g. Elsevier/ScienceDirect; JSTOR; PsycArticles)
- Interlibrary Loan fulfills more than 1,100 document delivery requests per year for articles from hard copy academic journals that are owned by and shelved in the library, indicating a need for these titles to be online; in-building use is low
- Usage of current issues of most general-interest hard copy magazines and newspapers (e.g. New Yorker, Newsweek, Rolling Stone, Portland Press Herald) is good; these would remain in print format

6. How much money will the library save by switching some journals to online-only?

- The library will use the difference in cost to meet expenses elsewhere, particularly as a realignment to deal with the yearly journal increases. The library may realize about \$6000 initially but this amount is not necessarily on-going and will change year to year.
- Future savings on binding will help pay fees for packages such as JSTOR, ScienceDirect, Springer, Taylor & Francis, Project MUSE, and others

7. How will the library and the community benefit from this action?

- Increased access to our subscriptions: at any hour, from any location, by unlimited users
- Access to additional titles requested by faculty in online publisher packages
- More study space in the library as many duplicate back issues in print can be stored off-site and fewer titles will require binding and shelving
- More staff and student hours for content creation and other local projects, such as digitization of unique materials

If you have further questions or comments regarding the planned action, please address them to Harlan Onsrud, Chair, Faculty Senate Library Committee, [onsrud@spatial.maine.edu](mailto:onsrud@spatial.maine.edu) for consideration by the committee.



**MOTION:** The faculty senate supports the elimination of paper versions of some online journals available through Fogler Library as described above.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed.

#### **Motion Title: Motion to Create Ad Hoc Committee on General Education**

##### **Preamble:**

Recent emphasis on learning outcomes across campus, coupled with an ongoing need to evaluate courses that fall under general education, has created time demands on the Academic Affairs Committee, diverting them from other key academic issues. This has pointed to the need for a Senate Committee on General Education, which will work with faculty and the administration on key issues related to general education at the University of Maine.

##### **Motion:**

The Senate will create an Ad Hoc Committee on General Education. This committee will be made up of a chair, who is a Senate Member and appointed by the President of the Senate, and at least five committee members, representing each College. At least half of the faculty membership of the committee must be members of the Faculty Senate. Further, the chair of the Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee (or his/her designee) will automatically serve as an ad hoc member of this committee.

During the 2009-2010 academic year, the establishment of this committee will be reviewed for possible recommendation as a standing committee.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed with one abstention.

#### **November 19, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting**

No motions

#### **December 17, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting**

At this time the Motion to Eliminate the BS Program in Environmental Management and Policy was put on the table for a vote.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed unanimously.

#### **January 28, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting**

##### **Resolution in Response to the Chancellor's Plan**

##### **Whereas:**

The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine applauds the efforts of the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to create a stronger and more stable financial base for the University of Maine System. We understand that transformational change is needed to meet the challenges of the current and future financial realities. We also recognize that we owe the citizens of this state our best efforts to be fiscally responsible, while at the same time, upholding our important role in educating students, creating new knowledge and innovation, providing service, and solving the challenges of our state, our nation, and the world.

While we support the spirit of change outlined in the Chancellor's plan, we have concerns about the process for determining change and the organizational direction suggested therein. Specifically, we believe that the concept of centralizing "back-room" functions at the system level contains serious flaws, further moving the university system in directions that have already damaged the campuses' abilities to fulfill their missions. In particular:

1. The proposal violates both the spirit and the language of UMS's original charter in ways that will undercut the system's effectiveness in governance. That charter calls for "oversight" of centralized functions. It neither calls for, nor implies, that the system office should carry out these functions for the campuses.
2. Experience to date with centralization of services at the system office has taught us that it does not save money. Just as the efforts in this direction by former Chancellor Westphal were based on promises of savings that never materialized, there appears to be little or no solid evidence or analysis behind claims that these "transformations" will save millions of dollars, as projected.
3. Past history has shown that this path toward centralization and homogenization is not advantageous to the campuses. It weakens their identity and damages their prestige, which negatively affect recruitment of top students and faculty members. It adds a level of bureaucracy that slows efficiency and adds costs. It extracts employees from campuses to serve at the system office at higher salaries, leaving the campuses to back-fill (at additional cost) in order to provide needed services locally that are not provided by the newly centralized services. It treats all campuses as the same, when in fact, the strengths of the different campuses are in their unique missions, strengths and reach around the state. It creates a "majority rules" environment, which has led to overly simplistic solutions, technical inefficiencies, and numerous frustrations for faculty, staff, and students alike. Problematic for all campuses, it specifically undermines the University of Maine, where the complexity of our research, service, and educational programs fits poorly with a one-size-fits-all approach.

We are also concerned that although claiming to lay out a process, many aspects of the “New Challenge, New Directions” plan are well under way and are proceeding before substantive input can be sought.

**Therefore, be it resolved:**

That, on behalf of the Faculty of the University of Maine, the Faculty Senate supports the commitment of the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to transform the University of Maine System to make it more financially sustainable, but only if such steps focus on the vitality of the campuses, not the growth of the system office. Proposed steps, such as those to centralize services at the system office, are unacceptable, fiscally unjustifiable, and will be opposed. Instead, we suggest the following course of action:

A. Buttress the Land Grant/Sea Grant, doctoral, and research functions of the flagship campus and reaffirm the important metropolitan and regional missions of the others. This should happen within a context of fiscal responsibility, eliminating unnecessary duplication across the system, streamlining operations, and emphasizing the unique roles each campus performs.

B. Where centralization of any operations would actually benefit the system and would be financially justified, designate the centralization of these services to one or another campus suited to the task.

C. Put an end to the practice of making system policy related to centralized services based on each campus having one “vote.” Although not written anywhere in the policy manual, this non-proportional voting is frequently used for system office projects, especially since MaineStreet was introduced. It leads to decisions that do not fit the various campuses well, and it ends up costing money as the campuses scramble to make adjustments to “retro-fit” for their individual campus needs. Instead, decisions related to centralized services should be made through proportional representation on committees, which should be charged to find flexible solutions that will work for each campus.

D. Dramatically downsize the system office and reaffirm its core functions of oversight and governance. The system’s strength depends not on the size of the system office, but on the reputation of the flagship university and the diversity and statewide coverage provided by all of the campuses within the system.

We believe the steps above will streamline operations, save resources, strengthen the campuses, and bring about the kind of positive transformation the Chancellor seeks.

**Voting Result:** The resolution passed unanimously.

**Motion Title:** Proposal to Establish Energy Grant Designations for Leading Public Research Universities

**Motion By:** Submitted by the Faculty of the University of Maine

**Motion**

On behalf of the faculty of the University of Maine, the Faculty Senate has developed an innovative idea to address the critical energy demands of the 21st Century. To accomplish this, we are proposing the creation of Energy Grant Universities, similar to the Land Grant, Sea Grant, and Space Grant designations that have enabled universities to tackle key challenges this country has faced over the past 150 years. It would be important, forward-thinking legislation with the potential to stimulate the economy, enable our country to make huge strides in energy innovation, and leave a lasting ecological legacy for generations to come.

The proposal emerges from the realization that our nation’s dependency on fossil fuels has created numerous problems, including exhaustion of fossil fuel resources, harmful effects on the environment, the real risk that our nation will fall behind other countries in developing alternative energy sources, and the threat to our national security. Our dependence on fossil fuels is so entrenched in our culture, that, until now, society has not felt a sense of urgency to perfect new technologies or test these in real world settings. However, recent world events and the hope inspired by a new President have raised our collective consciousness about the need for change.

Universities are in a unique role to lead the country forward – as they did after Civil War (through Land Grant legislation, 1862) to educate citizens and develop agriculture and mechanical technology; as they did (through Sea Grant legislation, 1966) to explore and find ways of saving and taking advantage of ocean resources; and as they did (through Space Grant legislation, 1989) to assist the exploration and exploitation of space. Universities have the knowledge base and research power to develop new technologies and serve as microenvironments in which to test these innovations. Energy Grant legislation would expand their capacity to conduct this important research and create models of sustainability, the knowledge from which could be transferred to the broader society. It will prepare the United States for the future, shift current and future energy demands, reduce emission of green house gasses, and create models of innovation nationwide. It will also serve to create employment and manufacturing capacity, while supporting state and local economies.

The proposal suggests designating Energy Grant status at leading public research universities across the country. This would catapult research and create model sustainability sites across the country. Each state has unique access to various alternative energy sources they might research and develop. The University of Maine, for example, is conducting cutting edge research on on-shore and off-shore wind, geothermal energy, tidal energy, and renewable forest-based energy. Universities across the nation are working on other alternative energy innovations, and a unified focus through Energy Grant Institutions would foster competition, collaboration, and cross-testing that would otherwise be very difficult to achieve. Further, each state would benefit through the creation of research and manufacturing opportunities that the research would engender. The idea is innovative, affordable, and very likely to change the course of our nation.

President Barack Obama has asserted a commitment to doubling alternative energy production during his first two years in office. He declared in his inaugural address, “We will restore science to its rightful place. . . . We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run

our factories.” This proposal is a cost effective way for the entire country to move in that direction.

Specifically, Energy Grant Universities would:

- Conduct research to discover scientific principles and technologies that would unlock new energy sources and perfect ways of rendering promising energy sources and technologies economically feasible;
- Work on the technologies themselves to bring them from promising concepts to workable ideas;
- Assist private industry in energy technology development;
- Serve as test beds for promising technologies by implementing them campuswide as replacements for old energy sources and old technologies;
- Serve as model communities of sustainability, where energy conservation, energy recycling, computer control of energy use, and application of new energy sources and technologies would be combined to make universities able to operate at high levels of efficiency. Develop such models so that they could be transferred to communities at large;

Participating Universities would benefit with increased enrollment of students interested in being part of transforming the energy landscape for the next century and through building enhancements as facilities are retrofitted to test new energy solutions.

The federal government would:

- Provide grants and support to develop projects and underwrite campus model energy programs;
- Enter into agreements with participating universities to provide return on investment by sharing the income from patents and licensed products.

The suggestions in this proposal are consistent with recommendations made by the American Physical Society Energy Efficiency Study Group ([http://www.aps.org/energy\\_efficiencyreport/report/aps-energyreport.pdf](http://www.aps.org/energy_efficiencyreport/report/aps-energyreport.pdf)). The creation of Energy Grant Institutions could also be a key focus for President-elect Obama's proposed "Agency for Energy Innovation."

Time is of the essence, and the nation needs big ideas and big initiatives, not incremental nibbling around the edges and imaginary twenty-year goals. The Land Grant movement was the biggest single event in the history of higher education, and its impact was a huge step in the great leap forward America made after the Civil War toward becoming a leading nation. Times call for world leadership again; and the nation(s) that grab hold of their energy policies and transform them to independence, renewability, and sustainability will be the nations that lead the rest of the twenty-first century. This proposal to create Energy Grant-designated universities will lead to improvements in energy creation, storage and use, while training the next generation of scientists, engineers, policy makers, and consumers for rational long and short term energy decisions.

#### **Therefore, Be It Resolved:**

That the Faculty Senate, on behalf of the faculty of the University of Maine, supports the *Proposal to Establish Energy Grant Designations for Leading Public Research Universities*. We further support efforts by Senators and other campus leaders to solicit broad-based national support for the proposal, in order to propel it forward at the federal level.

**Voting Result:** The Resolution passed unanimously.

**Motion Title:** to Recommend the Elimination of the Undergraduate Academic Degree in Information Science and Engineering

**Motion By:** PCRRC

On the recommendation of the faculty of the Department of Spatial Information Science and Engineering, the PCRRC regretfully recommends the elimination of the Undergraduate Academic Degree in Information Science and Engineering. The PCRRC concurs with the faculty of the Department of Spatial Information Science and Engineering that the elimination of the program represents a lost opportunity for the State of Maine, a loss which could only be remediated through substantive investment in the field. We highly recommend that every member of the UMS Board of Trustees read comprehensively the uncontested full report of the concerned faculty entitled, *BS Information Systems Engineering Degree Elimination*, publicly accessible at /faculty/senate/PCRRC before voting to eliminate this program.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed unanimously.

#### **February 25, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Motion:** Motion to Approve Shared Governance Policy

**Motion by:**

#### **Preamble**

The Board of Trustees of the University of Maine System has charged each campus to create a Shared Governance Policy to become part of the Bylaws for the Faculty Senate. Representatives from the Faculty Senate and University administration have worked collaboratively for over a year to develop this policy, which has both an enduring philosophy statement and a more fluid implementation section. In the true spirit of shared governance, the implementation section can be revisited, as specified, making it responsive to university change and growth.

#### **Motion**

The Faculty Senate supports the Shared Governance Policy and recommends that it be turned over to the Secretary of Senate as proposed Bylaw Changes to be voted on 45 days hence.

There was some discussion regarding the Shared Governance motion.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed with 1 abstention after a few friendly amendments.

**Motion Title: General Education motion**

**Motion by:** Dan Belknap, Chair, Academic Affairs Committee:

**Motion**

The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate moves formal acceptance of the General Education Student Learner Outcomes and Assessments per category, as developed by the General Education Working Groups, Center for Teaching Excellence, and the Ad Hoc Committee for General Education Requirements of the Faculty Senate, as submitted in written form today, February 25, 2009.

**Voting Result:** Passed with 1 abstention.

**April 1, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Motion:** Motion to Support ADVANCE Grant brought forward by the Environment Committee.

**Voting Result:** approved unanimously.

**Motion:** Motion to Accept the 15 Step Process brought forward by the Program Creation, Review & Reorganization Committee.

**Voting Result:** carried unanimously.

**Motion:** Motion to change the reporting schedule for Incomplete grades and to establish a clear and simple reporting form brought forward by the Academic Affairs Committee.

**Voting Result:** passed, 1 abstention.

**April 22, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Motion Title: Priority Registration for Student Athletes**

**Motion:** The UMaine Athletic Advisory Committee in March, 2009 unanimously approved a motion that modifies the University's current "Priority Registration Policy" for student athletes. The UMAAC changed it from one that applies only to a single semester, for students busy with their sport that season, to a policy that applies to all student athletes both semesters. The proposed modification stems from today's more modern student athlete who has an academic-year-long commitment to practices, etc. Also of significance here is that our current policy gives student athletes registration priority essentially equal to Senior Class status, which could conceivably result in displacement of non-student athlete seniors for classes they need to graduate; our proposed policy would eliminate that possibility and give student athletes only Junior Class status (unless they are Seniors, of course). The proposed new policy conforms to that recommended by the NCAA, and it conforms to that of all the other schools in our conference (America East).

**University of Maine**

Priority Registration Policy for Student-Athletes  
Effective May 1, 2009

Whereas University of Maine NCAA Division I student-athletes often face conflicts in the timing of mandatory or required classes and team practices, and

Whereas the current University of Maine policy, which states: *"Student-Athletes who will be in outside competition in the upcoming semester may register for classes on the first day of the pre-registration period"* [emphasis added], does not account for year-round commitments of student-athletes, and

Whereas all other America East Conference schools permit priority registration every term, and

Whereas the NCAA encourages priority registration for classes for all student-athletes;

The University of Maine Athletic Advisory Board, in order to foster the timely completion of degrees for its student-athletes, recommends the following policy be adopted:

As of May 1, 2009, all University of Maine student-athletes, except Seniors, shall be given priority in the registration for classes equivalent to that of students with Junior class standing.

The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs committee endorses this motion, and recommends full senate approval.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed.

## **May 27, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting**

### **Resolution to Codify Committees of the Administration**

Whereas Committees of the Administration serve an important shared governance function, and Whereas the list of the Committees of the Administration has not been updated in several years, and Whereas there is a need for transparency about the Committees of the Administration, including the charge to each committee, and the committee membership transparent on campus.

Therefore, be it resolved that the committees listed below are sanctioned by the Faculty Senate as Committees of the Administration. The list is divided into three sections: 1) Those committees for which membership shall include, in part, faculty members chosen through the Committee on Committees process, as outlined in the Shared Governance understanding of April 2009; 2) Those committees for which there will be a Faculty Senate Representative, who is charged to report back to the Senate on important issues emanating from that committee; and 3) Those committees that at this time do not need faculty membership through a Senate process.

Be it resolved that the charge for each committee be posted on the university website, along with the names of committee members.

Be it resolved that changes to this list, which the Senate recognizes may at times be prudent or necessary, will be brought to the Senate for collaboration.

Section 1 *Committees for which membership shall include, in part, faculty members chosen through the Committee on Committees Process:*

Academic Policy Planning and Implementation Committee

Academic Standing Committee

Athletic Advisory Board

Campus Budget Committee

Campus Planning Committee

Cultural Affairs Committee

Environmental Health and Safety Committee

Honorary Degree Committee

President's Council on Disabilities

President's Council on Women

Presidential Research Award Committee

Presidential Teaching Award Committee

Presidential Service Award Committee

Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee

Scientific Misconduct Committee

Steve Gould Award Committee

Student Administrative Appeal Board

Student Conduct Code Committee

Student Employment Advisory Committee

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Improvement Committee

Tenure Advisory Committee

Undergraduate Program Curriculum Committee

Section 2 *Committees for which there will be a Faculty Senate Representative, who is charged to report back to the Senate on important issues emanating from that committee:*

Bachelor of University Studies Steering Committees

Graduate Board

Graduation and Retention Rate Improvement Team

Honors Council

I.T. Council

ROTC Committee

University Research Council

University Teaching Council

Section 3 *Committees for which faculty membership is not determined through a Senate process.*

Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee

Institutional Biosafety Committee

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Parking and Safety Committee

Radiation Safety Committee

Security Committee

**Voting Result:** The motion passed.

## 2007 – 2008 Motions

### September 19, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting

No motions

### October 17, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting

#### **Proposed Amendment to Bylaws of the Faculty Senate**

Article IV Section 5: Change to read as follows

*Article IV Section 5. Research and Scholarship Committee*

*A. Function. The Committee on Research and Scholarship reviews and makes recommendations to the Senate in matters relating to research including research priorities, research funds, patents, the protection of human and animal subjects, and research safety.*

*B. Membership. The members of the Committee on Research and Scholarship are the Vice President for Research, and one faculty Senator from each college.*

Add the following section to Article IV of the Bylaws

*Article IV Section 9: Service & Outreach Committee*

*A. Function: Reviews and makes recommendations to the Senate regarding service and outreach issues and opportunities that affect the university and its communities.*

*B. Membership: At least one member from each of the colleges, and one faculty Senator from Cooperative Extension.*

This motion is a change to the By-Laws of senate and so has gone through the process of proposal, sending out for comment during a 45 day period, and discussion in senate.

There was no discussion at this time.

**Voting Result:** Motion passed unanimously.

### November 11, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting

No motions

## **December 12, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting**

### **Motion to Reauthorize *The University of Maine Policy on Program Creation and Reorganization***

Whereas a motion was passed by the Faculty Senate on October 18, 2006 creating the Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee (PCRRC); and

Whereas in February 2007 the Faculty Senate approved *The University of Maine Policy on Program Creation and Reorganization*; and

Whereas this was signed into policy by the President in March 2007; and

Whereas there was an agreement to review this policy one year after its implementation; and

Whereas the Constitution of the Faculty Senate establishes its jurisdiction and responsibility to make recommendations regarding academic matters, including program creation and reorganization; and

Whereas the PCRRC and the administration have demonstrated that *The University of Maine Policy on Program Creation and Reorganization* is an excellent example of procedures that promote shared governance by providing a process for considering reorganization proposals;

### **Therefore**

The Committee of the Elected Members moves that *The University of Maine Policy on Program Creation and Reorganization* be reauthorized by the Faculty Senate and recommended to the President as standing policy.

**Voting Result:** motion passed unanimously.

### **UMaine Faculty Senate Academic Motion 2007-08 Number 2**

Whereas, the Faculty Senate has requested the opportunity to nominate faculty for participation on:

Provost's Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (4 nominees, to be staggered terms),

Provost's Faculty Advisory Committee (6 nominees from which 4 are selected, plus the senate president), and

Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Team (6 nominees from which 4 are selected, plus the senate president);

And whereas the Provost has offered the opportunity for the Faculty Senate to nominate the faculty to serve on these committees;

Therefore, the Faculty Senate and the Administration agree that the Faculty Senate will forward nominations for all faculty appointed to each committee.

**Voting Result:** motion passed unanimously.

### **UMaine Faculty Senate Motion 2007-08 Number 3**

Whereas, because the President and the Vice President of the Faculty Senate are both going to be away from campus during January and part of February,

Therefore, the Faculty Senate affirms that Beth Wiemann will be President Pro-Tem during their absence.

**Voting Result:** motion passed unanimously.

## **January 30, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting**

No motions

## **February 27, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting**

No Motions

## **April 2, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting**

### **Announcement of a Proposed Amendment to the Bylaws to the Constitution of the Faculty Senate:**

Officially Designating "Past President"

The President of Faculty Senate serves for a one-year term, after which many go off the Senate. The loss of the past president to the Senate hinders ongoing momentum, leaving the new president to serve without the benefit of the former president's institutional memory and experience.

In order to create a more seamless transition from one Faculty Senate president to the next, the Constitution and Bylaws Committee is suggesting the following be added to the Bylaws, Article IV, Section 1B.

Section 1B:

The immediate past president of the Senate will hold, for a period of one year, the designation “Past President” and will serve as a non-voting member of the Senate Executive Committee and hold a seat at Senate meetings.

**Voting Result:** The motion was made, seconded. A vote was called. Motion passed unanimously.

### **Announcement of a Proposed Amendment of the Bylaws to the Constitution of the Faculty Senate: Additional Areas of Responsibility for the University Environment Committee**

The Senate routinely is asked to review and make recommendations on items that relate to the natural environment on campus and to family and gender issues; however, there is nowhere in the charge to the Standing Committees that includes these important roles.

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee, in conjunction with the University Environment Committee, is suggesting the following be added to Article IV, Section 3A of the Bylaws: (The proposed additions are underlined.)

#### **Section 3. UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

A. Function. The Committee on the University Environment reviews and makes recommendations to the Senate in matters relating to the academic and physical environment of the university including cultural programs; free speech and assembly; athletics; public relations; residential life; conduct; safety; facilities; recycling, energy and resource conservation; and family and gender issues.

**Voting Result:** Motion was made, seconded, motion passed unanimously.

### **Motion of Support for the University of Maine’s Mission Statement**

#### **Preamble**

In 2007, a Committee of the Administration was formed to review and update the University’s Mission Statement. The committee consisted of six faculty members, one from each College and one from Cooperative Extension, including Pat Burns (Liberal Arts and Sciences), Catherine Elliott (Cooperative Extension); Dianne Hoff (Education and Human Development), Scott Johnson (Natural Sciences, Forestry, and Agriculture), Michael Peterson, chairperson (Engineering), and Robert Strong (Business, Public Policy, and Health). Four of the six faculty members also served on the Faculty Senate, including the chairperson. Dan Sandweiss (Dean and Associate Provost for Graduate Studies) also served on the committee, and Len Kass coordinated our efforts within the broader context of the NEASC self-study.

The committee worked collaboratively to analyze the existing Mission Statement, explore models used by other campuses, and brainstorm key points for a revised version. Over 50 drafts of a new mission statement were written and circulated among the committee in an iterative process over four months.

In December 2007 a preliminary draft was distributed at the Faculty Senate and Provost for comment. Although it is impossible to incorporate every person’s specific suggestions, the committee considered all input and made further revisions, which are incorporated in the version below. If the Senate endorses this Mission Statement, it will next go to the President for approval and will be incorporated into the NEASC Self-Study, under Standard One, “Mission and Purpose.” (All 11 NEASC standards will be available for review by the faculty and community at large later this spring.) Once all campus approvals have been obtained, the Mission Statement will be sent to the Board of Trustees for final approval. It will then become the official Mission Statement of the University of Maine.

#### **Motion**

The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine endorses the 2008 revision of the University Mission Statement, and encourages the committee to move the document to the President and the Board of Trustees for approval.

There was some discussion regarding the mission statement, with one person suggesting that it be re-worded to be more upbeat.

**Voting Result:** The Motion was tabled.

### **MOTION PREAMBLE**

#### **Action Plan for Implementing a University of Maine Institutional Repository**

Report by the Library Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate

**Should the University of Maine support an Open Access Institutional Repository?**



Yes. Many universities have been around longer than the nations in which they reside. For long term archiving of the most valuable products of their own students and faculty Universities are a better bet for long-term stability than many of the alternatives. If scholarly products are deposited using open access licenses, the products can be mirrored in disciplinary depositories (physics, chemistry, etc.) as well as the more general repositories being developed by others. This helps ensure their long-term survivability and increased accessibility through evolving search tools. An institutional repository allows each campus scholar, if they so desire, to create a long-term legacy collection of their scholarly works as those works are created. More than 1,000 other universities worldwide already have launched institutional repositories, <<http://www.openoar.org/index.html>>.

**Funding Agency Policy Trends:** On 26 December 2007, President Bush signed an appropriations bill instructing the NIH to mandate open access for NIH-funded research. The NIH was clearly ready and released the text of its policy just 16 days later. (NIH policy: <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-08-033.html>, FAQ for the new policy: <http://publicaccess.nih.gov/FAQ.htm>). The policy applies to all peer-reviewed articles that arise, in whole or in part, from direct costs funded by NIH, or from NIH staff, that are accepted for publication on or after April 7, 2008. Thus articles arising from currently funded NIH projects must also meet this requirement. Beginning on 27 May 2008 anyone submitting an application, proposal or progress report to the NIH must include the Pub Med Central or NIH Manuscript Submission reference number when citing applicable articles that arise from their NIH funded research. For more information, consult <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/02-02-08.htm>

Actions by other funding agencies could occur just as quickly. Other agencies such as NSF are more likely to allow reference to any long-term institutional or disciplinary repository. For example, the European Research Council now requires that the intellectual works resulting from its funding be placed in open access repositories but, unlike NIH, encourages placement in the author's institutional repository. The University of Maine needs a repository allowing scholars from across all of its disciplinary domains to have a ready long-term repository for their works.

### **What types of scholarly materials should the UMaine repository support?**

Our recommendation is to plan for the future. Allow for the ingesting, open access licensing and metadata documentation of all forms of non-royalty-producing scholarly work products, e.g. research reports, journal articles, teaching materials, data sets upon which research results are based, student portfolios, music, video, and all major new file types as they emerge. Note that the new NIH policy applies to all graphics and supplemental materials that are associated with the article.

The choice of repository software system should be determined by the products to be ingested and the documentation and linking services to be offered. Open source software such as D-space, Fedora and similar content management systems (e.g. typo3) with large support bases in the academic and non-profit communities should be high on the list for consideration. The repository should be a resource for archiving the productivity of researchers, faculty, students and staff at the University of Maine and made available for personnel on all UMS campuses.

**Action:** Document the benefits and drawbacks of each major repository software system option and the initial and continuing costs of each option. Arrive at a specific option recommendation and a proposal for covering the costs.

### **What are the potential challenges with instituting an institutional repository?**

**Costs:** The leading open source repository software is now well-established and relatively straightforward to install and maintain. Contributors use a web interface to upload their own works, license their works, and provide information about their contribution (i.e. create "metadata"). The entire process only takes a few minutes for the typical professor or student after having walked through the system once. The process is very user friendly. Thus, there is little need to provide cataloging or even "web-form completion help services" by library staff. Once installed, the library's primary burden is maintaining and upgrading the hardware and software infrastructure, providing regular backups for the content, installing new versions of software or expanding capabilities over time, and removing challenged materials until such challenges are resolved.

**Lack of Deposits:** By far the greatest concern in instituting such a repository as observed through the experiences of other universities is lack of extensive use of the facility by faculty and students for depositing their works due to lack of incentives to do so. Closer to home, the history of deposits of electronic theses and dissertations on our own campus offers such a lesson. That is, most theses deposited are from departments that require it. The cost of implementing a repository is very small compared to the substantial benefits and visibility we would gain by making our university knowledge advancements accessible to the world. However, even with a small investment, we should maximize our return on that investment by providing non-monetary incentives that ensure widespread deposits by our faculty, researchers and students.

### **What incentives should we provide that will encourage researchers, faculty and students to deposit their research, scholarly, creative, and teaching works within such a repository?**

First, train our emerging scholars by engaging them in the practice of open archiving and showing them that an open access deposit can strongly support their publication and scholarly advancement interests. We should **mandate all thesis and dissertation submissions** be placed in the electronic repository as a condition of graduation. This precedent is already well established for two programs on campus and has created little to no controversy for students. In fact, students have said they would much rather have their work freely accessible to the world electronically than have the university sell rights to a private company to distribute their work for which they receive no economic compensation. A new repository software system could provide an option allowing students to embargo the release of their electronic thesis for up to a specified time (e.g. 6 months or a year) with the simple click of a check box. After that time tolls, the full text document is automatically made available to the world through the repository and picked up by search engines. For a discussion on why open access to electronic theses and dissertations should be mandated, consult <http://publications.drdo.gov.in/ojs/index.php/djlit/article/viewFile/252/104>

There should be **no campus mandates for faculty** requiring them to deposit any works in the campus repository. Rather non-monetary incentives that provide immediate visible benefits and user-friendly enablement technologies should be sufficient to generate enthusiastic use of the repository by most faculty and researchers.

**Action:** Work with the graduate board to explore and, if strong graduate board support exists, pursue the requirement of mandating that all thesis and dissertation submissions be placed in the existing thesis repository or the new institutional repository as a condition of graduation.

## **What are the specific actions that need to be taken to create appropriate incentives to contribute?**

### **(1) Provide legal clarity for the works provided to the university repository.**

**Issue:** The University of Maine System (UMS) intellectual property policy already makes it very clear that, in terms of claims between employees or students and the University administration, faculty and student authors have copyright interest in the vast majority of their scholarly and teaching materials and the university disclaims little to no legal copyright interest in them. The UMS policy further encourages faculty and students to use this clear legal authority to license their works to the “commons” or “public domain” using open access licenses. Thus, the official university policy is to encourage you NOT to give up your copyright to publishers, or at least retain the right to place your work openly on your university website and/or a repository of the university.

**Action:** When the UMS open access license policy was initially instituted in 2002, a specific open access license was recommended. Since then, over 50 million web sites and documents have been licensed using Creative Commons (CC) licenses. This suite of licenses is now the standard and we should make a slight revision to the UMS IP policies recommending these open access licenses for faculty and students. As such, these also would be the licenses used in conjunction with the repository software. Develop the language to alter the UMS policy and pursue the change.

**Action:** In implementing the software, separate CC licenses should be recommended automatically for creative works (journal articles, books, videos) versus datasets but authors should have the option of choosing less recommended open access licenses for either if authors prefer them. An automatic embargo option capability should be provided. Explore the software options for accomplishing these goals.

**Issue:** Most scholarly publishers request that authors sign a form copyright agreement the terms of which were written by that publisher. As a result of the high price of scholarly journals, the widespread organized resistance by the academic community, and the emergence of growing numbers of highly respected open access journals (e.g. <http://www.doaj.org>) through a marketplace reaction, over ninety percent of private scholarly publishers now allow scholarly authors to deposit their own journal articles in their own university or other not-for-profit electronic repositories, <<http://romeo.eprints.org/stats.php>>.

**Action:** The University of Maine should pass a policy stating: It is the formal policy of the University of Maine to highly encourage all faculty, staff and students to (a) deposit final copies of all their published scholarly works within the electronic University of Maine Institutional Repository (UMIR) using the licensing mechanisms provided through the system, (b) submit their articles and other scholarly works to those journals and other outlets that allow the deposit of such works in the UMIR, and (c) serve as editors and reviewers primarily of those scholarly outlets that allow the deposit of scholarly works produced by University of Maine community members within the UMIR. Prepare the specific suggested language for the new policy.

**Action:** Create a standard University of Maine Publisher Agreement Addendum that comports with the above policy. Rather than negotiating terms with publishers, faculty may then simply add in the following language at the bottom of any publisher form contract that they are requested to sign:

*All terms as listed above are subject to predominant rights and terms established by the University of Maine Publisher Agreement Addendum (UMPAA) that may be found at <http://xxx.umaine.edu> and is made a part of this agreement.*

Prepare and review appropriate language for this document for use by faculty and students.

If the scholarly publisher refuses to accept this statement (most will accept it), the author may still publish with that publisher but the work could not be included in the UMIR. This will likely result in considerably less visibility compared to the work that is openly archived. Studies have shown that open access articles (including those published in non-open access journals and deposited in an open access repository) are cited 50-250% times more often than non-open access articles published in the same issues of the same journals, <<http://opcit.eprints.org/oacitation-biblio.html>>.

### **(2) Request the *open access URL* for each item listed on a faculty member's vita when that vita is submitted within any campus review process.**

**Issue:** As evidenced by the new NIH policy, there is a requirement trend emerging within proposal submission and research reporting environments across science that asks for open access URLs so that any scientist in the world may help in the review process. If *open access URL's* are requested, faculty have an incentive to provide them. This campus can provide the enabling technology through its institutional repository system to make the deposit and linking of scholarly products simple.

**Action:** Request that various campus award committees alter their application requirements to include a request for the open access URLs where the applicant's work products may be viewed. Prepare suggested revisions to the several standard applications for campus awards, including applications for promotion and tenure that will now request open access URL links for the scholarly products that the applicant is reporting.

### **(3) Provide user-friendly enabling technology for faculty to automate the generation of vitas in various formats from the Faculty/Staff Profile Database.**

**Action:** Revise the online faculty profile database <<https://library.umaine.edu/fsprofile/index.aspx>> so that it requests *open access URLs* for any work products reported, in addition to any *restricted URLs* where the work may be available. This open access URL could be to a server located anywhere but our UMaine repository is likely to be the easiest to reference. The faculty profile database should be tied to the institutional repository such that faculty may upload and document their papers if they are not already in the repository. If a faculty member does not provide

an *open access URL* when reporting their scholarly productivity, the link obviously will not be supplied from the database when a report is automatically generated. The explicit action is to show the additional items to be requested within the Faculty/Staff Profile Database.

**Action:** Alter the online Faculty/Staff Profile Database to make it of substantially increased benefit to faculty by automating the generation of vitas, reports and award applications. The output may be in Word or another format of the faculty member's choosing. Thus the report may be edited but most basic information will already be there in the proper format. The explicit action is to provide the list of reports and award applications that will be automatically populated with the faculty member's data and generated with a single click.

## **MOTION**

The proposed actions above are approved in concept by the University of Maine Faculty Senate. The Library Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate is charged by the Faculty Senate to pursue, in collaboration with the University Maine library, the implementation of an institutional repository on the UMaine campus. In doing so, it should investigate and pursue with other appropriate committees and authorities on and off the University of Maine campus the items labeled above as **actions**.

**Voting Results:** This motion was moved, seconded, and passed.

## **May 7, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting**

### **Motion to Support the University of Maine's Mission Statement**

#### **Mission Statement**

The University of Maine advances learning and discovery through excellence and innovation in undergraduate and graduate academic programs while addressing the complex challenges and opportunities of the 21st Century through research-based knowledge.

Opportunity for all members of the University of Maine community is a cornerstone of our mission. The University welcomes students, research partners, and collaborators into an atmosphere that honors the heritage and diversity of our state and nation.

Founded in 1865, the University of Maine is a Land and Sea Grant institution and the flagship campus of the University of Maine System. This vibrant and dynamic university serves the residents of Maine, the nation, and the world through our acclaimed programs in teaching, research, and outreach.

Inspiring and dedicated *teaching* propels students into new fields of learning and promotes interdisciplinary understanding. Our educational goal is to help students develop their creative abilities, communication and critical thinking skills, and understanding of traditions in ethics and rationality within the arts, sciences, and professions.

Internationally-recognized *research, scholarship, and creative activity* distinguish the University of Maine as the state's flagship university, where faculty and students contribute knowledge to issues of local, national, and international significance. As the state's doctoral-granting institution, research and education are inextricably linked.

Comprehensive *outreach*, including public service, cooperative extension, continuing education, and distance learning, engages learners of all ages in improving their lives and communities. Using research-based knowledge, outreach efforts promote sustainable use of Maine's abundant natural resources, and build intellectual, cultural, and economic capacity throughout Maine and beyond.

Through integrated teaching, research and outreach, the University of Maine improves the quality of life for people in Maine and around the world, and promotes responsible stewardship of human, natural, and financial resources.

#### **Preamble**

In 2007, a committee of the Administration was formed to review and update the University's Mission Statement. The committee consisted of six faculty members, one from each College and one from Cooperative Extension, including Pat Burns (Liberal Arts and Sciences), Catherine Elliott (Cooperative Extension), Dianne Hoff (Education and Human Development), Scott Johnson (Natural Sciences, Forestry and Agriculture), Michael Peterson, chairperson (Engineering), and Robert Strong (Business, Public Policy, and Health). Four of the six faculty members also served on the Faculty Senate, including the chairperson. Dan Sandweiss (Dean and Associate Provost for Graduate Studies) also served on the committee, and Len Kass coordinated our efforts within the broader context of the NEASC self-study.

The committee worked collaboratively to analyze the existing Mission Statement, explore models used by other campuses, and brainstorm key points for a revised version. Over 50 drafts of a new mission statement were written and circulated among the committee in an iterative process over four months.

In December 2007 a preliminary draft was distributed at the Faculty Senate and Provost for comment. Although it is impossible to incorporate every person's specific suggestions, the committee considered all input and made further revisions, which are incorporated in the version below. If the Senate endorses this Mission Statement, it will next go to the President for approval and will be incorporated into the NEASC Self-Study, under Standard One, "Mission and Purpose." (All 11 NEASC standards will be available for review by the faculty and community at large later this spring.) Once all campus approvals have been obtained, the Mission Statement will be sent to the Board of Trustees for final approval. It will then become the official Mission Statement of the University of Maine.

#### **Motion**

The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine endorses the 2008 revision of the University Mission Statement, and encourages the committee to move the document to the President and the Board of Trustees for approval.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed.

## 2006 – 2007 Motions

### September 20, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting

No motions

### October 18, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting

#### Motion on Policy and Procedures for Program Creation and Reorganization

Whereas the Constitution of the Faculty Senate establishes its jurisdiction and responsibility to make recommendations regarding academic matters, including program creation and reorganization, and

Whereas the President of the University of Maine, in his letter of August 14, 2006, to the Faculty Senate, invited the Faculty Senate, in the spirit of shared governance, to provide guiding principles for considering reorganization proposals

Therefore

The Committee of the Elected Members moves that the University of Maine Policy on Program Creation and Reorganization be approved by the Faculty Senate and recommended to the President for implementation.

**Voting Result:** motion passed, 42 for, none opposed, 1 abstention.

### November 15, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting

#### Motion to Approve the Posthumous Degree Policy for Undergraduate, Master's and PhD Degrees

##### PhD Degrees

**Preamble:** The University of Maine ordinarily awards undergraduate and graduate degrees only to those candidates who have completed all course work and other requirements necessary to earn the degree. However, given the somewhat extended nature of a graduate student's dissertation preparation, occasions may arise in which a student passes away just prior to completing the final

doctoral degree requirements. This policy permits the University of Maine to confer a doctoral degree to a deceased graduate student who has been admitted to candidacy and has completed all work except submission of the final dissertation, and who would likely have finished the remaining degree requirements within a year of the death.

**Procedure:** Upon receiving signed approval from the student's dissertation committee, the graduate program coordinator and/or department chair forwards a nomination letter to the Dean of the Graduate School expressing support for the conferral of the posthumous doctoral degree. The letter should address how close the student was to completing the dissertation at the time of his/her death. The nomination packet should also include the student's C.V. and may also contain letters of support from other faculty members. The Dean of the Graduate School will confer with the Executive Committee of the Graduate Board about awarding the degree posthumously. If the review is favorable, the Dean will forward a recommendation to the Provost and the President that the doctoral degree be conferred posthumously. The President will then inform the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs of the University's decision.

##### Undergraduate and Master's Degrees

The following policy is to govern the awarding of degrees posthumously at The University of Maine:

##### Requirements:

A posthumous degree may be awarded if:

At the time of death the student had completed all requirements of their degree program and would have qualified for graduation; or

At the time of death the student was enrolled in their final semester, was taking the necessary courses to complete their degree requirements, and their instructors and/or advisor can show that the student was likely to complete the coursework satisfactorily.

##### Procedure:

A request for a posthumous degree is made to the chair of the student's department by family, friends, or faculty members who have worked with the student. A death certificate and proof of their relationship to the student must be made available:

If the above requirements have been met, the request will go to the Associate Dean of the college/Graduate School for approval;

Provost reviews and makes recommendation to the President;

President has final approval;

The approved request is forwarded to the Office of Student Records.

**Awarding of Posthumous Degree:**

The student's diploma and transcript will note that the degree was awarded posthumously;

The student's name will appear in the commencement program, along with their hometown and a note that the degree was awarded posthumously;

The President, Provost or their designee(s) will hold a private reception with the family and friends of the deceased and present the degree at the reception.

The Academic Affairs Committee presented the motion. The motion was seconded.

A question was asked as to how often this happens. Dr. Kennedy said that it doesn't happen very often, but it happened twice last year.

**Voting Results:** A vote was called. The motion passed 33 for, none opposed.

**December 14, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Motion by:** Academic Affairs Committee

**Motion:** Both matriculated and non-matriculated part-time *undergraduate* students who take at least 12 credits over two semesters are eligible to be on the Dean's list, provided that they have a grade point average of at least 3.33.

The motion was seconded.

Some discussion ensued regarding undergraduate students and graduate students. A friendly amendment was suggested that "*undergraduate*" be added before "...students" in the motion. This was accepted.

A question was asked whether PeopleSoft could be programmed to only include matriculated and full-time students. It cannot.

Another person stated that as more and more students are attending part-time, many due to the fact that they also work full-time jobs, it would be appropriate to recognize these students in this way. Non-traditional students should be eligible for this.

Another question was asked if this also pertains to summer session. Dr. Hunter felt that this does not pertain to summer credits, but she stated she would check on this after the meeting.

A motion was made to call the question. The motion failed to be seconded.

A vote was taken on the motion.

**Voting Results:** 22 for, 9 opposed, 3 abstentions. The motion passed.

**January 31, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Proposed Amendment to Bylaws:**

That the bylaws be amended to include, following Article IV, Section 7:

Article IV

Section 8. Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee.

A. Function. The committee has the responsibility to receive and review proposals for the creation and reorganization of academic programs. Once the information is gathered and evaluated, the committee will present a recommendation to the faculty senate for its approval.

B. Membership. This committee will consist of a minimum of ten faculty senators, including two from each college. Members of this committee may be members of other standing senate committee.

Senator Gilbert said the only business was to change the by-laws to add another committee – the amendments to art. 4 sec. 7 and art. 4 sec. 8 – review committee with function of receiving and reviewing proposals for creation and reorganization of academic programs. Once evaluated, the committee would present that program to Faculty Senate for approval.

One senator asked for clarification on the number of 10 members for the committee. Vice President Gilbert said they would be 10 faculty senators.

Senator Hoff moved to approve the motion and it was put up for discussion.

Senator Wihry asked about status of proposal for reevaluation of programs.

Senator Gilbert said this relates directly – He and President Kass met with Provost Szymanski last Monday. As a result, he drafted minutes of our understanding of procedure – Len agreed w/Jim's minutes. Len passed on to Provost. Admin does have some difficulties as it is now stated. Jim thinks it will happen, but question is how and when. Once Provost returns her response, Jim will share everything with Faculty Senate. The document is an understanding of what was discussed in the Monday meeting of the Provost, President Kass, and Vice President Gilbert.

President Kass said that at the next members only meeting this will be a topic of discussion. He wants to keep this short, but his impression is that the administration is earnest and wants a plan that is workable. Their thinking is that we should have a trial period of maybe 6 months. The interest is in seeing how it works in practice. President Kass says he and Senator Gilbert thought perhaps by January of 08 we could have a permanent document.

Senator McClymer commented that this started with no consultation w/senate. We were just told. We're partly to blame because we're letting it happen.

Senator Slott mentioned the trial period and the committee. If it's just on trial period, how binding will the decision be? Point of order from Senator Halteman: Are we discussing motion on the floor?

President Kass: yes. The motion on floor is to create a special subcommittee to deal with these issues.

Senator Ferland –noted that whatever the negotiations, it is a good idea to create a committee that will fully inform FS of negotiations with the administration.

Senator Halteman said the committee could be formed almost immediately. Vice President Gilbert said the committee must report to all – and needs to be accountable to Faculty Senate.

President Kass asked if there were any further discussion. If not, we would bring the motion to a vote.

Senator Schonberger asked if we would start and staff the committee immediately. President Kass replied that we would do so as soon as legally possible – as soon as we enact it and it becomes part of by-laws. Schonberger said there are some fairly big changes in the works now so it is advantageous to have this.

**Voting Result:** The vote was: 25 yes 0 no 1 abstention

### **February 28, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Policy and Procedures for Program Creation and Reorganization Document** presented by Dr. Jim Gilbert

#### **The University of Maine Policy and Procedures for**

#### **Program Creation and Reorganization**

##### **PURPOSE**

This document states the general principles and procedures that guide reorganization of academic units. These general principles and procedures are meant to affirm the University's commitment to shared governance, academic freedom, affirmative action, and accountability; to assure faculty members that their concerns and ideas are incorporated to the extent possible as decisions are made; and to ensure that the overall academic quality of the University's programs is maintained as reorganization takes place.

##### **PRINCIPLES**

As the University of Maine responds to changing resources and the changing needs of Maine's citizens, it may find that reorganizing programs is necessary or desirable to achieve its goals. Any proposed reorganization should maximize the University's resources and better serve our students and faculty.

Reorganization of programs takes place through a process of shared governance. Shared governance recognizes value and necessity of faculty input and knowledge in academic decision making. The faculty's involvement is provided for in the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, which provides for faculty jurisdiction and advice on academic issues.

We recognize that such reorganizations are also governed by the University of Maine System Policy and Procedures for Reorganization of Programs (Section 309). At the University of Maine, the primary responsibility for ensuring appropriate consultation with the faculty rests with the President, the Provost, and the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Senate's Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee (PCRR) will be responsible for receiving comments and drafting a response in support of or in opposition to any reorganization proposal deemed by the Committee to be subject to a full review by the committee and the Faculty Senate.

##### **SCOPE**

This review process will be applied to all proposals required to be approved by the Chancellor's Office or the Board of Trustees, regardless of whether the Board's authority or Chancellor's Office authority has been waived. Proposals that involve any of the following would normally be subject to academic review by the Faculty Senate:

1. All university reorganizations involving major university academic units such as colleges, schools, academic divisions, departments, and academic programs.
2. Reorganization, establishment, or merging of colleges, schools, academic divisions and departments, off-campus instructional centers, and centers, institutes and laboratories.
3. Establishment of university centers or other new units which provide credit bearing courses or degrees.

##### **PROCEDURE**

The review procedure will consist of 1) a discussion phase, 2) an informal phase and 3) a formal phase. The discussion phase will be a verbal information exchange and a discussion of a potential plan. The informal phase will be a broad-based information exchange of a brief written proposal. The formal phase is initiated by the Faculty Senate and its PCRRRC for those informal proposals deemed by the PCRRRC to have significant academic implications.

1) The discussion phase normally will involve the Provost and the Senate President. If mutually agreeable, the information will be made available to the faculty.

2) The informal phase of review is normally initiated by a two-page written pre-proposal from the administration to the Faculty Senate that summarizes the proposed change, its resource costs and benefits, and its impact on academic programs. This pre-proposal will be posted and widely disseminated by the Senate to solicit comments from the faculty. If the Senate's review committee determines that there is insignificant academic impact from the proposed reorganization, there will be no formal review process. If the review committee determines that the proposed reorganization has potentially significant academic impacts, it will request additional information in preparation of a formal review phase.

3) The formal review phase will require a written proposal that shall include a rationale and substantiated justification, with appropriate data, to support the proposed reorganization. Any proposal will include:

1. a description of the proposed program creation or reorganization and identification of the program(s) involved;
2. a rationale for the proposed reorganization;
3. a list of potential impacts, including budget impacts;
4. the timing for implementation of any decisions; and
5. a detailed narrative considering the criteria in Appendix A

The PCRRRC will post the proposal and widely circulate it on campus. Written comments in support of and in opposition to the proposal will be solicited. A public hearing will be held to gather additional information. Following this, the review committee will write an opinion on the proposal.

While normally a proposal will be initiated by the administration, the senate may initiate this process if they believe program revision falls within the jurisdiction of this policy. In

such cases, the Faculty Senate will request discussion of the proposal with the administration.

## **TIMELINE**

The review process for a proposed program creation or reorganization should be initiated sufficiently early that meaningful input is possible. The Faculty Senate and its review committee normally will have two months to solicit comments, hold a hearing, and make a recommendation in support or opposition to the proposal. If the proposal is amended, additional time may be required for the Faculty Senate to reach a consensus. While the Faculty Senate needs the flexibility and time to investigate situations brought before it in order to attain adequate understanding of the issue, it is expected that the Faculty Senate, in special circumstances, will act on a request within an expedited time frame that is consistent with university and external constraints defining the context for change.

1. The review process begins when the Faculty Senate receives a complete proposal for reorganization.
2. In the next two weeks, the review committee will solicit written input from units, faculty, and students whom it considers may be impacted by the reorganization. The review committee will request comments from any faculty member, student, or administrator who wants to comment on the proposed reorganization.
3. Approximately one month from receiving the proposal, the review committee will have a public meeting to hear presentations for and against the reorganization. The review committee will transmit its written recommendations to the next Faculty Senate Meeting for consideration. If the Faculty Senate fails to act on the recommendation, the review committee's recommendations will be considered those of the Senate.
4. The Faculty Senate's written recommendations, including an assessment of the positive and negative impacts of the proposed reorganization or elimination, will be reported to the Provost and President within one week after the Faculty Senate has finished evaluating the options for reorganization or elimination.
5. A summary of the Faculty Senate's recommendations will be incorporated into any proposal that the President of The University of Maine sends to the Chancellor and the UMS Board of Trustees for approval. A copy of the proposal to the Board will be sent to the Faculty Senate.

## **REVIEW**

**This policy is subject to review and revision one year from implementation. It is expected that as the Administration and the Faculty Senate gain experience with reviews of program creations and reorganization, changes to improve the policy will become apparent.**

### **Appendix A. Criteria for Reorganization**

1. Criteria Supporting Reorganization
  - a. On a national or international level, the profession or discipline has changed.
  - b. Reorganization will better serve the strategic focus of The University of Maine.
  - c. The proposed reorganization provides a competitive advantage to the unit.
  - d. The viability of the unit is at risk without refocus of direction.
  - e. The program's scope is too narrowly focused and needs broader, perhaps interdisciplinary, focus or conversely the program scope is too broadly focused and needs tighter focus.

- f. Two or more programs have a substantial similarity or affinity of objectives such that economics of operation or improvement in quality may reasonable be expected from their consolidation.
- g. The clarity of the program's identity and function will be increased by transfer to or consolidation with another program.
- h. The program's contribution to The University of Maine missions of teaching, research, and service does not justify maintenance of its present size.
- i. Budgetary constraints require reorganization of a program within a department, school, or college.

## 2. Criteria Contraindicating Reorganization

- a. The reorganization is sufficiently uncommon within higher education so as to render difficulty in recruitment and retention of quality students and faculty.
- b. The reorganization would endanger the quality and/or accreditation status, where applicable, of one or more of the programs affected.
- c. The programs, though dealing with similar subject matter, are substantially different in orientation, objective or clientele.
- d. The cost reduction of reorganization would be so modest as to make such reorganization rather pointless if cost savings is the primary objective.
- e. The program's reorganization would have a substantially negative impact on education and societal concerns to Maine.
- f. The program's reorganization would have a substantially negative impact on strategic goals of The University of Maine.
- g. The program's reorganization would result in substantial loss of revenue currently derived from grants, contracts, endowments or gifts.

Dr. Gilbert stated that this is the same document that was presented to the Elected Members two weeks ago with the exception of a change in the Discussion section on page two of the document. He then proceeded to ask the senate to approve the policy so that it may be sent to President Kennedy for approval.

A question was asked as pertains to the statement in item number one under "Procedure" in particular the phrase "If mutually agreeable, the information.....". What happens if it is not mutually agreeable? Dr. Gilbert said that this document is basically the same as the one passed in September, but in this version at least there is a discussion phase of the process, which is a definite improvement.

There were no additional comments or questions.

A vote was called on the policy.

**Voting Results:** 27 voted to approved. 0 voted against. 2 abstentions.

## April 4, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting

### Motion to Approve the 2007-2008 Academic Calendar

The Faculty Senate approves and recommends the adoption of the 2007-2008 Academic Calendar.

A friendly amendment was made to remove the "and recommends the adoption of" from the motion. Agreed.

**Voting Results:** The motion passed.

### Motion to Approve Revised Student Evaluation of Teaching Form.

The Faculty Senate recommends that the revised Student Evaluation of Teaching form (SET) replace the old version of the SET for those colleges, departments, units, etc., that continue to use the old SET form.

Dr. Kornfield introduced the motion. He noted the error that info to be used in P&T decisions. (see p. 3 "The info you provide..." paragraph) A series of committees attempted to revise the form. Faculty Senate charged Academic Affairs to work on the issue, and this committee in turn charged the University Teaching Council to work on the form. There is opportunity to insert further questions. Reference was made to the School of Engineering Technology and its form. This is not an attempt to replace their form, but it is a recommendation that units consider adapting this new SET instead of the old one.

Harland Onsrud commented that he thought the form is excellent and the best he's seen. However, he encouraged members to vote against the form unless the word "legibly" is added to the instructions which the instructor reads to the students..."unless you sign the form legibly". A signature is not valid unless it provides identity. If we don't add this word, we are promoting an unethical practice.

Dr. Onsrud moved that the word LEGIBLY be added, as a friendly amendment. This was seconded. A voted was called, 28 in favor, 2 opposed, no abstentions.

A question was asked why the signature line was removed from the form. The removal of the line was discussed and agreed upon at the elected members meeting.

**Voting Results:** The motion was then put back on the table. A vote was taken. The motion passed.



## **Motion to Ensure Security for Faculty Members entering Data in the Electronic Faculty Profile Database System**

Scott Johnson introduced the motion for the Executive Committee which represents all of the standing committees of the senate. Dr. Johnson read the preamble and the motion:

The University of Maine is preparing to implement an electronic Faculty Profile Database System near the end of this academic year (spring, 2007). This web-based system will be used by all faculty members at the University of Maine for annual reporting purposes.

This system evolved from a report by the University Research Council's sub-committee on Research and Scholarship Measures. The Research Council's sub-committee report was presented to the full Faculty Senate by Dr. Shannon Martin on November 16, 2005.

From Senate Minutes, November, 2005:

*"Dr. Shannon Martin, Chair of the Scholarship Measure Committee of the University Research Council*

*President Hayes introduced Dr. Martin. Dr. Martin has been working on a sub-committee of the University Research Council to develop a university-wide set of procedures to measure our creative activity which is inclusive of all disciplines. Dr. Martin distributed copies of a report that has been produced by the sub-committee (a copy of the report is available upon request).*

*She began by describing the committee and its inception. It was organized in January 2005 and was charged with reporting the scholarship measures, research products and creative outcomes thought to meet the standards of our academic faculty at this university. The committee finished its work in April. She gave an outline of their progress and the kinds of work which fell into different categories."*

Following the subcommittee's work, there were many months of meetings with stakeholders around campus, which generated additional input and ideas. In planning and development the electronic reporting process, the goal was to make the database as inclusive as possible, so that all faculty members would have an opportunity to highlight their work, and so that stakeholders could tap the information for various purposes (development office, media, institutional research, etc).

Because the College of Natural Sciences, Forestry and Agriculture had been using and continually improving an electronic reporting system for several years, a decision was made to use that system as a platform upon which to develop a university-wide system. NSFA faculty completed their FY2006 annual reports using the new, expanded system as a pilot project, and work over the past year has gone into using that experience to refine and debug the system.

In addition, this semester (spring, 2007) the system was made available to Deans, Associate Deans, Faculty Senate Executive Committee members, and many others on campus in order to conduct one final round of modifications before initial launch. Many additional modifications have been made as a result.

Each department and college will have a Unit Administrator who will have access to their unit's data and be able to generate a variety of reports from it (this feature is still in the process of being refined). The senior administrative leaders at UM, and other designated entities, will have administrative access to all of the information in the system.

No doubt there will be additional modifications to the system over the next few years in order to fully satisfy the range of faculty activities. However, the one question that the Senate Executive Committee felt needed to be resolved now was the issue of data security in the following sense. Each faculty member is solely responsible for the content of their own annual reports, and under no circumstances should any entries in a faculty member's report be altered without that person's approval. In addition, a statement to this effect should accompany any instructional text associated with the database so that it is not lost across administrative generations.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee proposes the following motion to address this issue.

### **Motion**

The accuracy of data entered into the Faculty Profile Database System is the sole responsibility of each individual faculty member. Clarification or correction of possible errors can be requested by any who view a faculty member's data entries. However, editing of, and correction to, any entries can only be done by the faculty member, or by a person who has been authorized in writing by the faculty member. A statement to this effect should be included in any instructional material accompanying the database system.

**Voting Results:** A vote was called. The motion passed, with 1 abstention.

### **May 2, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Motion Title:** "Rights and Responsibilities related to Academic Advising" **Motion by:** Aria Amirbahman

### **RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES RELATED TO ACADEMIC ADVISING**

Academic advising is a shared responsibility between advisor and student. It is an educational process designed to facilitate effective navigation of programmatic requirements and instructional resources.

### **GOALS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING**

Help students clarify their academic values, goals and aspirations;

Lead students to understand better the nature and purpose of higher education;

Provide accurate information about educational requirements, policies, and procedures;

Develop an educational program consistent with the student's interests and abilities;

Assist students in a continual monitoring and evaluation of their educational progress;

Integrate the many resources of the University of Maine to meet the student's individual educational needs and aspirations.

IT IS EXPECTED THAT THE ADVISOR WILL: Help the student define and develop realistic goals;

Understand student needs and match those needs with available campus resources, both academic and personal;

Assist students with planning an academic program consistent with their abilities and interests;

Monitor the student's progress and provide accurate ongoing feedback information;

Discuss linkage between academic preparation and their future career path.

IT IS EXPECTED THAT THE STUDENT WILL: Take the initiative in arranging timely appointments with his/her advisor;

Participate fully as an active learner in the advising process;

Maintain a personal record of academic progress and achievements;

Accept responsibility for choices, decisions and actions that affect his/her academic success;

Gather all relevant information needed to make informed decisions;

Clarify personal values, goals and aspirations;

Become knowledgeable about the University of Maine's programs, policies and procedures

Be well prepared for the advising session.

#### **Motion:**

The Faculty Senate approves and recommends the adoption of the Rights and Responsibilities related to Academic Advising, including the stated goals and the expectations from the advisor and the student.

**Voting Results:** The motion passed.

## **2005 – 2006 Motions**

### **September xx, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting**

No motions

### **October xx, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **November xx, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **December xx, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **January xx, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **February xx, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **March xx, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **April xx, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **May xx, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

## **2004 – 2005 Motions**

### **September xx, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting**

No motions

### **October xx, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **November xx, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **December xx, 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **January xx, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **February xx, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **March xx, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **April xx, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

### **May xx, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting**

– to be supplied

## **2003 – 2004 Motions**

### **September 24, 2003 Motions**

No motions

### **October 22, 2003 Motions**

No motions

### **November 19, 2003 Motions**

#### ***EMERGENCY FUNDING FOR FOGLER LIBRARY MOTION***

The Library Committee, Emergency Funding for Fogler Library Motion

Faculty Senate, November 2003

#### **Introduction:**

Due to escalating journal costs and flat funding for the library's base budget, Fogler Library faced a \$650,000 deficit in its acquisitions budget last summer. The Provost was able to redirect \$300,000 to this problem, but that still left a huge deficit, resulting in 901 academic journals being cut or changed to electronic-only versions. This was done with only minimal communication and input from the faculty, and it negatively affected both the teaching and research capabilities of the faculty and students of this university. There is another \$350,000 dollars set aside for acquiring new journals in order to allow those programs and professors who have no materials in their field to acquire core journals. Although this is a worthy cause, there is still no process in place for how this money will be allocated or for how to balance equity issues across campus. The Library Task Force and the Faculty Senate Library Committee are working on this issue, but it will take some time to develop a process, particularly if the input from constituents throughout the university is sought. In the meantime, many core journals are being lost from our collection.

#### **Motion:**

Recognizing that the cuts to journals this summer affected core journals in many disciplines, the Faculty Senate asks the Provost of the University to release the \$350,000 earmarked for purchasing new journals and redirect it for the most needed journals, including reinstatements. We are requesting this allocation for just one year in order to give the Library Task Force and the Faculty Senate time to develop a process that is fair to all departments for acquiring new journals, replacing existing journals, and/or for culling journals as necessary.

**Vote on motion:** Thirty one in favor, 2 abstentions. Motion passed.

## **ESTABLISHING A CLEAR PROCESS FOR DETERMINING FACULTY POSITIONS**

The Environment Committee, Faculty Senate, November 2003

### **Introduction:**

Over the past year, the process for determining new faculty positions and the replacement of faculty members in existing positions vacated by retirements, departures, and terminations, has changed substantially. Currently, all determinations now reside in the Office of the Provost, who apportions funding according to the general guidelines set forth by the Strategic Plan and the Incentivized Budget Plan. Unfortunately, the faculty perceive themselves as becoming increasingly alienated from the process, which in this distancing, makes it increasingly difficult for departments and colleges to plan for the future as their disciplines change and grow.

### **Motion:**

The Faculty Senate asks that the Office of the Provost write a clear policy for determining decisions about the creation of new faculty positions and retention of vacated positions that departments and colleges deem as needing replacement. We ask that the Office of Provost include faculty representatives of the five colleges in their draughting of these policies, that they have these guidelines in place by January, 2004, and that they publish them permanently through ready access in the University's web pages.

Provost Kennedy suggested two amendments: 1) ...that they have these guidelines in place by *15 February 2004*, and 2) ...faculty representatives of the five colleges and *Cooperative Extension* in their draughting of these policies...

Jim Horan offered another friendly amendment: ...the office of the Provost *in conjunction with* faculty representatives of the five colleges *as elected by faculty of these colleges*...

**Vote on amendments:** Twenty nine in favor, 3 opposed, and one abstained. The amendments passed.

## **ASSOCIATE VICE-PRESIDENT FOR LIBRARIES MOTION**

The Library Committee, The Library Head Motion

Faculty Senate, November 2003

### **Introduction:**

Upon the retirement of Dr. Elaine Albright as the Dean of Cultural Affairs and Libraries, the University of Maine has sought to replace her with someone in a lesser position, the Head of Libraries. As a Dean, Dr. Albright reported directly to the Provost, a placement which included her in all major University discussions on funding, academic planning, and assessment. The proposed Head of Libraries would report to the Associate Vice-President of Academic Affairs, which would remove this vital Library representative from these important discussions. A search of other Carnegie Doctoral Research Intensive Universities reveals that the position is most typically defined as a dean or associate vice-president, reporting directly to the equivalent of our Provost.

### **Motion:**

Recognizing that the Library is the heart of the University, in its providing vital services to all disciplines, the Faculty Senate asks that the President of the University redefine the Head of Libraries position to an Associate Vice-President of Libraries, reporting directly to the Provost and included in funding, academic planning, and assessment meetings.

**Vote on motion:** Thirty in favor, 3 abstentions. Motion passed.

## **December 17, 2003 Motions**

### **Inclusion of the Section on "Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Programs and Endeavors" in the Undergraduate Catalog at the University of Maine**

The Interdisciplinary Studies Committee

December 17, 2003.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate proposes that the *Undergraduate Catalog* include a section on "Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Programs and Endeavors", and that the substance of that section be the following description and categorization of programs and endeavors currently operating at the University of Maine. The IDS Committee proposes that this list be included in the current on-line catalog as soon as practically possible, and in the next printed version.

### **Undergraduate Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Programs and Endeavors at the University of Maine**

*The University of Maine boasts a vibrant array of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary programs and endeavors. Such activities have become the hallmark of intellectual vitality and excellence in contemporary higher education. The University of Maine offers an exceptionally wide range of opportunities for all members of the University community—undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty members, staff members, and administrators—to participate in scholarly undertakings that involve multiple academic disciplines. The categories below provide a schematic outline of the range of such opportunities currently available to undergraduate students at the University of Maine; other endeavors may be in the planning stages, and the University actively fosters the expansion of this critical aspect of its overall mission of teaching, research, and public service.*

#### **I. Matrix for Undergraduate Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Programs**

The University of Maine has 4 types of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary programs at the undergraduate level: *Majors, Minors, Certificate Programs, and Curriculum Concentrations*. Each of the last three of these types supplements but does not replace an academic major.

**Multidisciplinary Studies Programs** are courses of study which require course work in more than one of the traditional disciplines (defined at the University of Maine by named departments), but do *not* have formally constituted, required course work or student research / scholarship that integrates multiple disciplines. **Interdisciplinary Studies Programs** are courses of study which require course work in more than one of the traditional disciplines (defined at the University of Maine by named departments), *and* have formally constituted course work or student research / scholarship that integrates multiple disciplines.

The matrix below indicates the program in each type.

#### **Majors:**

Interdisciplinary Program	Multidisciplinary Programs	B.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies	Financial Economics (B.A.)
Environmental Science (B.S.)	International Affairs (B.A.)	Engineering Physics (B.S.)	Ecology and Landscape Horticulture (B.S.)
New Media (B.A.)			
Resource and Agribusiness Management			
Sustainable Agriculture (B.S.)			
Women's Studies (B.A.)			

#### **Minors:**

Bio-Medical Engineering (B.S.)	
Canadian Studies	Classical Studies*
Franco-American Studies*	Film and Video
Linguistics	Fisheries Minor
Museum Studies	Marxist and Socialist Studies*
Museum Education	
Medieval and Renaissance Studies*	
Native American Studies	Pre-Medical Studies
Religious Studies*	
Pre-Professional Health Studies	
Public Relations	

(\*also offered as a Curriculum Concentration)

#### **Certificate Programs:**

Maine Studies Certificate	Classical Studies Certificate
Museum Studies Certificate	

#### **Curriculum Concentrations:**

Disability Studies	Adventure Recreation Business
Equine Business Management (B.S.)	Management (B.A.)
Franco-American Studies*	Classical Studies*
Peace Studies	Criminal Justice Administration
Religious Studies*	Geography
Latin American Studies	
Legal Studies	
Marxist and Socialist Studies*	
Medieval and Renaissance Studies*	

(\*also offered as a Minor)

#### **II. Other Interdisciplinary Endeavors at the University of Maine:**

Academy of Public Service (joint endeavor of UM Dept. of Public Administration; M.C.Smith Center, and the Muskie Institute of USM)

Advanced Engineered Wood Composites Center  
 Bureau of Labor Education  
 Canadian-American Center  
 Center for Community Inclusion and Disability Studies

Center on Aging  
Cooperative Extension Service  
Franco-American Center  
Honors College  
Institute for Quaternary and Climate Studies  
Laboratory for Surface Science and Technology  
Maine Folklife Center  
Margaret Chase Smith Center for Public Policy  
Peace Studies Office  
Pulp and Paper Process Development Center  
Research Collaborative on Violence Against Women  
Senator George J. Mitchell Center for Environmental and Watershed Research  
Solar Vehicle Team (College of Engineering)  
Wabanaki Center  
William Cohen Center for Public Policy and Commerce  
Women's Resource Center

The above motion was amended to include the certificate "Teaching English Speakers of Other Languages."

The amendment was accepted and the motion carried unanimously.

### **January 28, 2004 Motions**

#### ***Doing Business in Iraq***

Michael Howard presented the following motion on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee:

#### **PREAMBLE**

Whereas President Hoff has presented the following principles as guidelines for involvement in the College of Business, Public Policy, and Health's conference on Doing Business in Iraq, co-sponsored with the US-Iraq Business Alliance:

"The conference must remain true to its core purpose – examination of the appropriate role in Iraq for U.S. businesses, and instruction in effective and ethical ways to do business in Iraq. It should not become a vehicle for advocating a political perspective regarding our country's military or geopolitical role in Iraq.

The conference should address and help delineate the difference between sound business practices that strengthen the country of Iraq vs. practices that one might consider "war profiteering."

UMaine professors must participate in the conference, not only as members of the audience but also as featured speakers. Their role should include addressing not only sound and profitable business practices, but the ethical and cultural considerations that attend doing business in other countries.

The issue of Iraqi national stability vis-a-vis business involvement in the country needs to be seriously addressed by the conference. What are the pros and cons of attempting to do business in a country where bullets are still flying? How much stabilization is necessary before it is advisable to enter a war-torn country and engage in business enterprises?

Lastly, UMaine should not be a member of an organization that will not publicly divulge the names of its members. If the University or any of its units have advertently or inadvertently joined such an organization, it should immediately withdraw its membership."

#### **MOTION**

Be it resolved that:

The Faculty Senate endorses President Hoff's five principles for a conference on Doing Business in Iraq, adds that the conference should include a diversity of perspectives on the ethics of doing business in Iraq, and advises that the College of BPPH withdraw from the conference and withdraw from the US-Iraq Business Alliance if it is not possible to revise the agenda and Alliance policy in conformity with these principles.

#### ***Establishing a Clear Process for Determining Faculty Positions***

The Environment Committee, The Faculty Senate, January, 2004

#### ***Introduction:***

Over the past year, the process for determining new faculty positions and the replacement of faculty members in existing positions vacated by retirements, departures, and terminations, has changed substantially. Currently, all determinations now reside in the Office of the Provost, who apportions funding according to the general guidelines set forth by the Strategic Plan and the Incentivized Budget Plan. The Faculty Senate appreciates the Provost's willingness to return decisions on positions to each College, and hopes that the current financial constraints, in further necessitating a clear, open policy, will help expedite this return.

#### ***Motion:***

The Faculty Senate asks that the Office of the Provost write a clear policy for determining decisions about the creation of new faculty positions and retention of vacated positions that departments and colleges deem as needing replacement. We ask that the Office of Provost work in conjunction with a faculty representative from each of the five Colleges and Cooperative Extension (each representative directly elected by that unit's faculty) in their draughting of these policies, that they have these guidelines in place by 28 February, 2004, and that they publish them permanently through ready access in the University's web-pages.

## **February 25, 2004 Motions**

### ***Motion on General Education***

John Maddaus presented the motion on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee.

#### **PREAMBLE:**

The Faculty Senate adopted general education course requirements for all undergraduate degree students at the University of Maine in 1995. When the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) continued the University's accreditation in 1999, it requested that our five-year interim report (Spring 2004), include a review of the University's efforts towards assessment of student learning outcomes with respect to general education. NEASC believes that outcomes assessment will provide data that can be used to promote program improvement and enhance student learning. The Faculty Senate adopted a resolution in January, 2003, calling for cooperative efforts to develop outcomes assessment for general education. During 2003, the Center for Teaching Excellence organized faculty workshops that identified potential outcomes for general education requirements and sample procedures for assessing those outcomes. On December 4, 2003, Virginia Nees-Hatlen, Interim Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence, submitted a detailed report to the Faculty Senate and the Administration describing the progress made and offering six (6) recommendations for further action, which form the primary basis for the following motion.

#### **MOTION:**

- 1) The Faculty Senate thanks the staff of the Center for Teaching Excellence and all faculty and administrators who have participated in discussions of outcomes assessment in general education for their efforts.
- 2) The Faculty Senate endorses the plans made by the Center for Teaching Excellence for an expanded dialogue on outcomes assessment in general education, and encourages all faculty members to attend those sessions. It encourages the CTE to continue its work regarding assessment through the 2004-2005 academic year. It encourages the use of the Bird and Bird Fund to support the development of faculty expertise in assessment of student outcomes in general education.
- 3) The Faculty Senate hereby creates an ad hoc Committee on General Education (Constitution, Article VII, Section 3). This committee will serve through the end of the Spring 2005 semester. It will monitor progress and develop policies on general education, as described in section 4) of this motion. The chair of this committee shall be appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate and shall be a member of Faculty Senate. One member of the committee shall be selected by the Committee on Committees for each general education requirement, from among the faculty teaching courses that qualify for that requirement. Additional faculty members shall be added, if necessary, to ensure that each College (including the Honors College) is represented. The Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence, the Chair of the Undergraduate Program Curriculum Committee, and the Director of Institutional Studies (or their designees) shall serve ex officio on the Committee.
- 4) The ad hoc Committee on General Education shall work with the Provost or designee to investigate policies and practices regarding outcomes assessment at other universities and to develop and submit to the Faculty Senate a University policy statement(s) on the following issues:
  - 1) how and when outcomes assessment data will be collected
  - 2) the management and appropriate use of outcomes assessment data.
  - 3) procedures for future revisions of the list of courses that qualify for each general education requirement, as well as of the categories themselves.

To the extent possible, decisions about general education should be based on analysis of data from existing general education courses.

- 5) The Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence shall report to the Chair of the ad hoc Committee on General Education and to the Provost or the Provost's designee by no later than February 15, 2005, on progress made with respect to outcomes assessment in general education. The ad hoc Committee on General Education shall report to the Faculty Senate no later than March 15, 2005.

### ***Motion to approve the Process for Reviewing and Updating The Fogler Library Journal Collection***

Dr. Sue Sullivan introduced the motion on behalf of the Library Committee.

#### **INTRODUCTION:**

In fall semester, 2003, Executive Vice President and Provost Robert Kennedy appointed a Task Force to make recommendations on how best to make adjustments in the Fogler journal collection in light of substantially increasing cost of journals, the increased number and specialization of journals, and Fogler Library storage issues. The Task Force approached this assignment with the following five postulates guiding its deliberations:

- 1) The Fogler acquisitions base budget must increase annually.
- 2) No increase that the University can sustain will be sufficient to allow business to continue as it has in the past. Hard decisions will need to be made often, if not annually.

- 3) A static journal collection, or one that changes only by attrition, is not acceptable. The collection needs to be reflective of the changing needs of the students and the faculty, which requires a continuing reassessment of the titles in the collection.
- 4) The monograph budget must not be starved to support an increasingly ravenous journal budget.
- 5) The problem of maintaining and improving access to information through the Fogler Library is not an issue internal to the University of Maine, to be dealt with by this institution alone. Fogler is Maine's only research library and serves a statewide clientele. Its resources must be available to all who need them, and this means the responsibility of maintaining them has to be shared more broadly by the UMS and the State of Maine.

The Task Force recognized that there had not been a well-articulated, inclusive process

for culling, changing, or adding journals to Fogler Library. It recommended that a new process be devised that will give faculty members a more direct voice in the decision-making, provide equity across disciplines, and include a communication component that will help keep the university community informed and involved. Because the Faculty Senate represents the faculty of the University as a whole, the Library Committee of the Senate was charged with the task of developing a recommendation for such a process.

#### **MOTION:**

In light of the substantially increasing cost of scholarly journals and the essential nature of these journals to the research and pedagogy of the faculty, the Faculty Senate supports the following inclusive process for reviewing and updating the Fogler Library journal collection each year:

**By February 1 Each Year:** The faculty will submit any requests for new journals (using the Fogler Library website), including information as to whether this request is to be held in case additional funds become available or whether this new journal should replace an existing one.

**By February 15 Each Year:** The Faculty Senate will inform all faculty that the annual review of scholarly journals will be conducted in March and encourage their participation in the process.

**By March 1 Each Year:** The Fogler Library Staff will provide information to the faculty, including:

- The estimated annual library collections budget, and the impact this will have on the journal collection;
- A list of all journals to which the library subscribes; and
- A list of the journals that are on the library's "Watch List" for possible cancellation and the *reason*, which might include:
  - o The journal is duplicated within the collection
  - o The journal is rarely used
  - o The journal has had a dramatic price increase
  - o Feedback that a journal is dated, no longer needed, etc.

**By March 15 Each Year:** The faculty will review the Watch List and respond to the library staff *in writing* if they feel a journal on the list is critical to their program or research.

**By Mid April (Prior to the April Faculty Senate Members' Meeting) :** Library staff will review the faculty responses and revise the "Watch List" as appropriate and feasible.

**By April 30:** The Faculty Senate will review the revised Watch List and respond if necessary. The Library Staff will use the feedback from the Faculty Senate to formulate the final "Watch List," which will form the basis for cuts if necessitated by the budget.

**By the First Faculty Senate Members' Meeting of the Fall Semester:** Since many actual acquisitions and cuts are made during the summer, the Library Staff will provide an update to the faculty about the status of the collection each fall.

It was mentioned that the March 15 deadline was to be pushed back because of spring break. The date will be changed to late March. No one was opposed to changing the date.

#### **March 31, 2004 Motions**

**Inclusion of the Section on "Graduate Interdisciplinary Endeavors at The University of Maine" in the Graduate Catalog at The University of Maine.**

The Interdisciplinary Studies Committee  
March 31, 2004

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate proposes that the *Graduate Catalog* include a section on "Graduate Interdisciplinary Endeavors", and that the substance of that section be the following description and categorization of programs and endeavors currently operating at the University of Maine. The IDS Committee proposes that this list be included in the current on-line catalog as soon as practically possible, and in the next printed version.

***Graduate Interdisciplinary Endeavors at The University of Maine***



*The University of Maine is firmly and deeply committed to the expansion of knowledge and understanding by encouraging various forms of interdisciplinary academic endeavor. Such activities have become the hallmark of academic excellence and a clear indicator of the intellectual vitality of modern institutions of higher learning. The University of Maine accordingly boasts a vibrant array of interdisciplinary activities that provide an exceptionally wide range of opportunities for all members of the University community—undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty members, staff members, and administrators—to participate in scholarly undertakings that involve multiple academic disciplines. The following list covers opportunities currently available to graduate students at the University of Maine; other endeavors may be in the planning stages, and the University actively fosters the expansion of this critical aspect of its overall mission of teaching, research, and public service.*

## **I. Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs**

Composite Studies (Graduate Certificate in *Advanced Engineered Wood Composites*) Disability Studies (graduate core)  
Ecology and Environmental Science  
Financial Economics (M.A.)  
Food and Nutrition Sciences (Ph.D. program)  
Forestry (MFY{non-thesis}, MS, Ph.D.)  
Health Care Administration (grad. certificate)  
Historical Archaeology (M.A. option)  
Information Systems (MS and graduate certificate)  
Interdisciplinary Ph.D. (various concentrations available, e.g., *Functional Genomics*)  
Landscape Horticulture emphasis within the M.S. degree program in Horticulture  
Marine Bio-Resources  
Master of Arts in Liberal Studies  
Master of Science in Teaching (concentrations in *Physics, Earth Sciences, Mathematics, ,or Generalist Option*)  
Plant Science (Ph.D. program; multi-departmental)  
Quaternary and Climate Studies  
Marine Policy (M.S.)  
Marine Sciences and Marine Policy Dual Degree Program (3 years: with an M.S. in Policy and an M.S. in one of the marine sciences)  
Water Resources (graduate concentration)  
Women's Studies (graduate concentration)

## **II. Other interdisciplinary endeavors:**

Academy of Public Service (*joint endeavor of UM Dept. of Public Administration; M.C.Smith Center, and the Muskie Institute of USM*)  
Advanced Engineered Wood Composites Center  
Canadian-American Center  
Center for Community Inclusion  
Cooperative Extension  
Division of Lifelong Learning  
Franco-American Center  
Institute for Quaternary and Climate Studies  
ITHCRA (Interdisciplinary Training for Health Care for Rural Areas Project)  
Laboratory for Surface Science and Technology  
Maine Folklife Center  
Margaret Chase Smith Center for Public Policy  
Pulp and Paper Process Development Center  
Research Collaborative on Violence Against Women  
Senator George J. Mitchell Center for Environmental and Watershed Research  
Solar Vehicle Team (College of Engineering)  
University of Maine Center on Aging  
Wabanaki Center  
William Cohen Center for Public Policy and Commerce

## **Resolution for the Faculty Senate**

### **Preamble**

University of Maine faculty members have expressed to faculty senators and UM-AFUM representatives grave concerns regarding promotion and tenure decision making on this campus. Concerns include the administration's unilateral attempt to change the process by which promotion and tenure criteria are defined, and the administration's use of promotion and tenure other than department criteria in its Spring 2004 decisions. Decisions made by the Provost's office overturning positive recommendations by peer committees, chairs, directors, and deans have caused an unprecedented amount of skepticism among faculty members regarding the academic fairness, consistency, objectivity, and defensibility of the review process in the Provost's office.

Faculty see evidence of the Provost's office substituting its own criteria for those defined by peer committees, thus appropriating peer committee authority and diminishing the pre-eminent roles of peers, chairs, directors, and deans in the tenure and promotion process. As well, faculty members question the composition of the Provost's advisory committee and thus its academic authority in promotion and tenure. The Provost's advisory committee appears not to be appropriately credentialed to represent the University's broad range of disciplines or its missions in teaching, service, scholarship, and research. The Provost's office unprecedented attempt to control the tenure and promotion process and the resulting erosion of shared governance represent an overreaching that is not acceptable to University of Maine faculty.

## **Resolution**

Whereas the Provost's office appears to have made an unprecedented number of promotion and tenure decisions contrary to department criteria and college review, the Faculty Senate resolves that the decision process be temporarily suspended in those cases in which positive recommendations by peer committees, chairs, directors, and deans have been overturned by the Provost's office. Those decisions shall be held in abeyance until such time that the Provost's office can demonstrate that its review process is fair, objective, and informed, and in accordance with peer committee criteria. The Senate further resolves that Provost's advisory committee should meet with the peer committees and faculty members in the affected cases so that the advisory committee can demonstrate that 1) it based its decision to deny on verifiable and reliable information, and 2) its own membership has the expertise and experience to evaluate the faculty member's credentials.

## **April 28, 2004 Motions**

### **A Motion on Review of the Student Evaluation Form for Faculty Teaching**

#### **Academic Affairs Committee**

Effective teaching is vital to the accomplishment of the University's mission of providing quality education to the citizens of Maine. Evaluation of teaching must be conducted in the most appropriate way to reflect this goal.

Student evaluations are mandated in the AFUM agreement as a means of improving instruction. Each department or unit can change its evaluation instrument, in conjunction with administrative review. The student evaluation instrument, which is often used as the default form by the University of Maine community, was introduced on a trial basis over 20 years ago and has not been revised since. It is not clear which aspects of teaching performance the form measures, and the form has never been validated, i.e. compared to other instruments.

Whereas student evaluations are the only way in which many units assess teaching performance for purposes of reappointment, tenure and promotion,

Whereas the non-traditional teaching approaches such as encouragement of active learning and team work, which are vital to the faculty mission to improve retention, are underemphasized by the current default evaluation instrument, and

Whereas the current instrument may negatively impact academic quality by emphasizing instructor qualities rather than performance (for example, question #13), it is proposed that:

#### **Motion**

Faculty Senate will establish an ad hoc standing committee to review and revise the current default student evaluation instrument. The committee will work closely with faculty senators, the Center for Teaching Excellence, representatives of the Provost, students, and other groups on campus concerned with this issue. The committee will consult contemporary research studies to recommend revisions to the current student evaluation instrument in a report to the Senate early in 2005.

As a result of these recommendations, departments or units may wish to change to the revised instrument, which may be done without initiating and undergoing administrative review.

#### **Discussion**

Alla Gamarnik presented the motion on behalf of a sub-committee of Academic Affairs. She began by explaining that the student evaluation form that is presently used is old and out-dated. It does not reflect what is currently considered important practices for teaching. Article #10 in the AFUM contract outlines general procedures in changing the student evaluation form and also why it is used. Also referenced was a motion passed by the Faculty Senate the previous year regarding student retention. Dr. Gamarnik stated that all faculty care what is written about them on evaluation forms not only faculty who are up for tenure and promotion. In many units this is the only way a faculty member is evaluated. What the motion is proposing is for the ad-hoc committee to produce an alternate form which should be presented to the Faculty Senate in 2005. If it is approved by use by the senate and the administration the units may then decide whether or not they wish to utilize it.

Dean Astumian stated that he is troubled that the student evaluation form would be the only method used by units to evaluate teaching. They are Student Evaluations which should be useful for the feedback the instructor receives, but he thinks a widespread academic tenet is that professors are evaluated by professors. So the evaluations form should be used as a flag for instructors as to what students think, but to take the information unfiltered from the forms and used them in factors of promotion and tenure is an abdication of the responsibility of the peer committee who can find out this information personally than by simply reading evaluation forms.

Alla Gamarnik agreed. The motion as it stands just pertains to the form and the form needs to be changed.

Jim Horan questioned the last paragraph specifically "by emphasizing instructor qualities rather than performance", he wanted to know what this means.

Question #13 on the evaluation form states "Overall, how would you rate the instructor?" This question is disconnected from the rest of the previous questions asked on the form.

Alla Gamarnik thinks that it is this question that is looked at by the administrators. She gave an example of how she averaged the answers on question #12 and compared that figure to an average of the answers on question #13. She also got permission from another instructor in her department to compare the same two questions. There was a large difference between the two averages for both. She thinks that sometimes a student can use any kind of reason to give a bad answer on 13.

Marie Hayes also wanted to mention that in the study the sub-committee did on this subject which was done in conjunction with the administration over an academic one-year period, one of the issues for many of the people involved is the worry that academic quality may be at stake for either question 13 or the idea of being popular with the students. Because as we know, when we push for higher performance, give more difficulty tests, ask students to do additional assignments, they sometimes do not get positive feedback from that. In fact those are the activities we should be rewarding. As Dr. Nunez stated, we want to produce a University of Maine graduate that will be recognized as distinctly from this campus. Anything that would improve academic quality without a cost should be taken seriously.

Peter Hoff commented that not only as a university officer but also as a person who devoted 10 years to helping work to define the evaluation of teaching and helping people become better teachers. He said that if he had a vote he would vote to approve the motion. He said he would vote for it more enthusiastically if the motion was even broader in its scope. He said that a task force should be formed to look at all the ways we encourage and evaluate teaching at the university, not just the evaluation form. What research that has been done on this subject is strongly supportive of the notion that students are very good judges of teaching. The debate over student evaluations could go on forever. The fact is that we should listen to our students and they can tell us a great deal. He still feels that peer committees should be encouraged to go into the classroom and watch an instructor. The best definition of teaching he's ever heard is to define teaching as the act of creating circumstances where learning will occur. This is where he comes around to question 13 being the sum of the parts issue. He's not sure if you added up the sum of all of the parts is any of them really get at the definition of what does this professor do to create circumstances where learning will occur, no matter what the performances are that lead to that point.

Kathleen March gave an example where she discussed the evaluation form with some of her upper level students in her Spanish class. She said, referring to question 1, "How prepared was the instructor for class?", that some of her students were not sure what "prepared" meant in the question. On question 4, "How clearly did the instructor present ideas and theories?", she questioned who defines "clearly", is it clear to the student or the instructor.

Someone mentioned that they will try to include a friendly amendment to the motion to include student representative as part of the group who will work on the new alternate form.

Alla Gamarnik questioned what a student representative would add to the committee. She said the purpose of the motion is not to count the forms as they are used now as less important or more important.

There continued to be some discussion about including student representatives in the process.

Kathleen March clarified the friendly amendment reading the portion of the motion that it would affect as "The committee will work closely with faculty senators, the Center for Teaching Excellence, representatives of the Provost, students, and other groups on campus concerned with this issue."

President Pearce called a vote on the amended motion.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

## **Motion for Increased Participation in Improving Higher Education in Maine**

### **The Environment Committee**

The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine recognize the need for the Draught Strategic Plan released by the University of Maine System on March 26, 2004, and welcomes its call for increasing the effectiveness of the System, particularly in building the "reputation and presence of the University of Maine, the breadth of its programs, and its strengths in research", and the recognition of the University of Maine as the Morrill Land Grant University and Sea Grant University, with the Fogler Library as the research library for the System.

As discussions of a plan move forward, the Faculty Senate requests elected representative members of the faculty participate with the University of Maine's Administration, the Chancellor's Office, and the Board of Trustees in the creation of the System-wide Strategic Plan, its implementations, its funding determinations, and its evaluation. Only through closely working together can these complementary components serve the vital higher educational needs of the people of Maine.

President Pearce gave a little background on this motion by stating that the Chancellor's Office was concerned because the union had not given the Strategic Plan a vote of approval. They felt that the Orono faculty of all the campuses would approve the plan, but because of the vote they were not so sure of this. Bryan felt that the faculty would probably be better off being a part of the strategic plan process than not having any part at all. So as a result of that, the Executive Committee got together and they came up with this two paragraph motion.

Michael Grillo wanted to clarify that this motion comes from the Environment Committee, who took some direction from the Executive Committee.

There was some discussion on who is presenting the motion. It then was mentioned that a motion could be made to include the Motion presented by the Environment Committee not the Executive Committee be the one voted on. There was a difference in wording in the second paragraph of the motion presented by the Environment Committee which stated the "the Faculty Senate requests elected representative members of faculty participate with the University of Maine's Administration, the Chancellor's Office...." The original motion, which was on the agenda did not mention elected representatives. The major theme of both motions was to make sure that faculty are participant in revising the plan, that faculty are participant in implementing the plan, that they are participant in the funding and that they are participant in the assessment of the plan.

Dianne Hoff requested a clarification of how the motion came about. She stated that the intent of the motion wasn't very clear. She said it sounded to her like the faculty senate put forth this motion to show support for the Strategic Plan.

Bryan said that the purpose of the motion was to show there were things in the strategic plan that the Orono faculty could support.

Jim Acheson moved that the senate support the first motion. He felt it was shorter and clearer.

The motion was seconded.

Dean Astumian requested that the motion included “elected representation” in its wording. Senator Grillo said that he would take that as a friendly amendment and that he would agree to the change if it pertained to the first motion. Jim Acheson agreed to the amendment.

There was discussion about the two motions. There was discussion about the proper process to discuss the two paragraph motion or the four paragraph motion.

Jim Horan commented on the motions, saying that he felt that these motions probably did not represent the opinion of the faculty of the University of Maine. Even though the senate technically represents the faculty, he felt that there would be some faculty who would not be in support of the motion. He felt the wording should say that the “faculty senate” supported the plan, rather than the whole faculty of the university.

Some concern was shown as to whether the motion would give the campus the appearance of being divided because AFUM voted against the strategic plan due to procedural reasons. Not because they didn’t want change but because of the process. Kathleen March stated that it made her uneasy, not because of one motion, two motions, or four motions being brought to the floor, but because making this statement for the University of Maine, and not having a clear plan, and not bringing the motion before the elected members, which is the normal accepted procedure. She said the strategic plan has a lot of good points, but she could not vote for the motion.

Michael Grillo said that the motion says that we recognize the “need” for a strategic plan.

The discussion continued. There was still concern that the motions had not been brought before the elected members meeting. Dianne Hoff brought up the comparison that in doing this the senate was behaving in much the same manner at the System Office, trying to forego the correct procedure, and not including other people in developing the motion.

Dean Astumian stated that it was the senate’s responsibility to make sure the faculty had some say in the plan, which he thought, was going to go forward. He said that the senate can either participate with the process from this point forward, or not.

Michael Grillo once again tried to explain the purpose of the motion by likening the plan to a train that is leaving the station; we’re not going to stop the train, and it was a question of taking the opportunity and insuring that there is representative faculty at each and every step of the way. Not just in the crafting and implementation, but in the funding and the assessment, and working with the other participants, the administration, the system office, and the BOT.

Kathleen March wanted to make a friendly amendment to the longer motion, the one that was on the table. Michael Grillo did not agree.

The discussion then focused on the first version of the motion.

There was a motion to replace the two-paragraph motion with the four-paragraph motion.

**A vote was called, the vote was in favor of the two-paragraph motion (19 to 14).**

The motion was modified by friendly amendments.

The question was called. A vote was taken to vote on the two-paragraph motion, including the friendly amendments. Michael Grillo read the final version out loud (see above). The vote passed.

**A vote was taken on the motion. The motion carried.**

## **Motion to Support Return of Indirect Cost To Fogler Library**

### **Research and Public Service Committee**

#### **Preamble**

The University of Maine Fogler Library and its research collections are critical for the success of research in the State of Maine. Currently, the Library is seriously under-funded, and one of the things that are hardest hit by this are the journals, other serials, and books that scientists and other scholars need to support their research.

According to the indirect cost (“overhead”) agreement negotiated with the Federal government, 1% of the indirect cost is to support the Library. Provost Kennedy has recently agreed, in principle, to earmark 1% of the indirect costs recovered (IRC) for the Library above and beyond the amount currently budgeted for the Library, subject to budgetary needs. This is good news indeed, and we applaud the Administration for this initiative, yet it does not go far enough. In the present budgetary climate, this 1% cannot be allocated. Also, 1% of the IRC is insufficient to support the research collections of the Library that support the University’s research efforts.

The Library needs this money as soon as possible, possibly even at the expense of other worthy uses for the IRC. The Library also needs additional funds, and the money generated by grants seems a logical place from which to obtain them.

#### **Motion**

Be it resolved that:

1. The Faculty Senate fully endorses the Provost's plan to earmark a minimum of 1% of the total indirect cost recovered to the Library for acquisitions to support research collections.
2. The Faculty Senate strongly urges that this money be given to the Library immediately.
3. The Administration establish additional "earmarks" from the System's revenue sources (such as the comprehensive fee) to help ensure appropriate future funding of scholarly materials and relevant IT infrastructure.
4. The Faculty Senate Library Advisory Committee is consulted to provide input towards the allocation of the above funds.
5. The Administration establish a mechanism whereby campuses throughout the UMS participate in earmark support of Fogler Library resources that are deemed or utilized as system-wide resources.

#### **Discussion:**

The purpose of the motion was to recognize additional resources for the library. Item #5 in the motion was added at the last elected members meeting. Because the library is recognized as the University of Maine System wide library, that there should be some kind of mechanism whereby campuses throughout the university system participate in an earmark system of support for the library.

Someone asked how much other campuses use Fogler. Joyce Rumery answered that she didn't have the data with her at the meeting, but that the library does a lot of work for the other campuses. She also stated that she didn't know if they had any money to support the library, but that the library does support them.

Provost Kennedy said that he supported the five points in the motion.

Dean Astumian said that in item #4, the wording should be changed to the Library Advisory Committee. (The original wording stated "an appropriate faculty senate committee"). He felt the wording should be specific, after all the senate does have a library advisory committee, and presumably they should be the ones to be consulted. He offered the changed in wording as a friendly amendment.

The motion, with the friendly amendment, was put up for a vote. **The motion carried unanimously.**

## **2002 – 2003 Motions**

### **September 25, 2002 Motions**

No motions

### **October 24, 2002 Motions**

#### **Motion regarding seven year rotating calendar.**

##### **Preamble**

The Faculty Senate adopted a seven-year rotating calendar in April of 1992. Since then, the calendar has been modified at least three times. First, the winter break between the final exam period and the commencement of classes for the Spring semester was extended with the adoption of a "Winter Term" that began in January, 1998. Second, the final exam period was changed from a four-day schedule to a five-day schedule. Finally, a holiday in honor of Martin Luther King Jr. was added on the third Monday in January. Two of these changes have created difficulties for some students.

First, the extension of the winter break resulted in complaints from a number of students who were required to take classes or to perform internships during "May term". Those complaints centered on the extension of May term activities into June and made summer employment difficult. Some also complained that the extended winter break was a waste of time for those not attending classes. Second, the extension of the exam schedule, while advantageous for most students, resulted in the last day of final exams being December 24th in 2004 and 2010, making travel difficult during the holiday period.

The proposed calendar returns to the seven year rotating calendar of 1992 and results in May term beginning at least one week earlier. Second, the calendar proposes that classes begin on August 30 in 2004 and 2010 avoiding the Christmas Eve exam problem.

##### **Motion**

The seven year rotating calendar, outlined below, should be adopted by the University.

Seven Year Rotating Calendar

Approved by Faculty Senate 4/1992

Changes since then are in italics.

I. When Labor Day is September 1:

Fall semester (2003, 2008, 2014)

Classes begin Tuesday, September 2 Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 13-14

Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 26

Classes end Friday December 12

Final exams December 15-19 (5 days)

Spring semester (2004, 2009, 2015)

Classes begin Monday, January 12 No classes on Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, January 19

7 weeks of classes

2 week spring break

7 weeks of classes

Maine Day penultimate Wednesday (approved through 2006)

1 week (5 days) of final exams

II. When Labor Day is September 2:

Fall semester (2002, 2013)

Classes begin Tuesday, September 3 Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 14-15

Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 27

Classes end Friday, December 13

Final exams December 16-20

Spring semester (2014)

Classes begin Monday, January 13 No classes on Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, January 20

(Same as spring semester above)

III. When Labor Day is September 3:

Fall semester (2007, 2012)

Classes begin Tuesday, September 4 Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 8-9

Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 21

Classes end Friday, December 14

Final exams December 17-21

Spring semester (2008, 2013)

Classes begin Monday, January 14 No classes on Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, January 21

(Same as spring semester above)

IV. When Labor Day is September 4:

Fall semester (2006, 2012)

Classes begin Tuesday, September 5 Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 9-10

Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 22

Classes end Friday, December 15

Final exams December 18-22

Spring semester (2007, 2013)

Classes begin Tuesday, January 16 {Martin Luther King, Jr., Day} (Same as spring semester above)

V. When Labor Day is September 5:

Fall semester (2005, 2011)

Classes begin Tuesday, September 6 Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 10-11

Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 23

Classes end Friday December 16

Final exams December 19-23

Spring semester (2006, 2012)

Classes begin Tuesday, January 17 {Martin Luther King, Jr., Day}{Same as spring semester above)

VI. When Labor Day is September 6:

Fall semester (2004, 2010)

Classes begin Monday, August 30 Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 11-12

Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 24

Classes end Friday December 10

Final exams December 13-17

Spring semester (2005, 2011)

Classes begin Monday, January 10 No classes Martin Luther King, Jr., Day, January 17

(Same as spring semester above)

VII. When Labor Day is September 7:

Fall semester (2009, 2015)

Classes begin Monday, August 31 No Classes on Labor Day, Monday September 7

Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 12-13

Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 25

Classes end Friday December 11

Final exams December 14-18

Spring semester (2010, 2016)

Classes begin Monday, January 11 No classes on Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, January 18

(Same as spring semester above)

## **Motion to amend the Constitution of the Faculty Senate regarding the composition of the Committee on Committees.**

### **Preamble**

It is difficult to find ten faculty members to take an active part in the Committee on Committees. As a result, the Committee on Committees frequently operates without a full complement of members. The purpose of this motion is to bring the constitution into alignment with current practice.

### **Motion**

To amend Article VII. Section 2 of the Constitution of the Faculty Senate as shown below:

Section 2. The Committee on Committees. Except for the Committee on Committee, in consultation with the appointed Chair, the Senate President will appoint the members of each standing committee. In appointing members, the Senate President will consider the need to balance membership continuity with new members in a given year. Committee membership is for one year, with the possibility of reappointment. The Committee on Committees, elected by the Senate, will consist of ten **one faculty Senate member from each college, one faculty Senate member from the University of Maine Cooperative Extension and the Graduate Student Association Representative to the Faculty Senate**. The faculty members shall reflect the proportional representation to each college on the Senate, with provision that each participating college and CES shall have at least one member. It shall be the responsibility of the President, Vice President/President-elect, and the Secretary to determine the number of positions to be allocated to each college. The Committee on Committees shall, at the request of the University President or designee, recommend faculty members to standing and ad hoc administrative committees or shall provide a list to the President or designee of faculty members who have agreed to serve on a specific committee.

NOTE: Additions are shown in bold and deletions as strike outs. The current version is shown below for reference.

The proposed change will align the membership of the Committee with existing and past practice.

In accord with the provisions of the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, 45 days advance notification is needed for changes to the Constitution. It will then require a 2/3 vote to go forward. The motion will be on the agenda for the November 20 Senate meeting. 10 days after publication of the minutes, the vote goes to the entire faculty. If 2/3 of the responses received are for the motion, it passes. Any comments to the committee for amendments must be done 15 days before the vote.

## **November 20, 2002 Motions**

### **Preamble:**

The Interdisciplinary Studies Committee presents the following revised guidelines from a motion approved by the Faculty Senate during its meeting on May 8, 2002 . The Interdisciplinary Studies Committee developed the guidelines in close cooperation with the Provost and the committee strongly urges the Senate to adopt the motion. Changes from the previously approved guidelines are underlined only for clarity.

#### **Motion and Guidelines:**

Interdisciplinary groups are self-governing bodies in which membership is based on scholarly interest in a particular field or discipline, regardless of departmental affiliation. These guidelines are intended to apply to interdisciplinary groups that involve faculty and resources from more than one College.

An interdisciplinary group may be formed by an ad hoc committee of the faculty or by a steering committee appointed by the Executive Vice President and Provost. Faculty membership in interdisciplinary groups is voluntary unless a joint-appointment was part of the faculty member's initial appointment to the University of Maine . Workload reassignments, joint evaluation procedures, and compensation for the faculty member and/or home departments of faculty members joining interdisciplinary groups may be subject to renegotiation at the time the faculty member joins the interdisciplinary group. All changes must be approved by the home department, the Dean of the home College, and the Provost. If a joint appointment between a department and an interdisciplinary group is part of a faculty member's job description when they are hired, then such negotiations should take place at the time of appointment. Some appointments may be joint, with a partial salary line.

Group members shall adopt bylaws that are subject to review and approved by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and/or the Graduate School depending on the nature and purpose of the group and which shall spell out the official reporting structure for the group. An Executive Committee selected from the group's membership shall oversee the administration of the program. The Executive Committee shall nominate members to serve on various standing committees for the group (e.g. Curriculum Committee, Membership Committee).

Interdisciplinary faculty groups may develop academic programs in accordance with available resources. With the exception of new concentrations offered under the existing Interdisciplinary Doctor of Philosophy program, a program proposed by a new interdisciplinary group is subject to the same review and approval process, both campus and system-wide, as a program proposed by a department. Existing group programs are also subject to the same review process as departmentally based programs to assure that program quality is maintained or improved. Groups may or may not formally sponsor courses, but do not receive support for the direct expenses of instruction. Instructional support for the group program shall be supplied by the department or departments providing the instructors. Departments receive workload credit for group course offerings just as for any other course.

#### **Establishment of Interdisciplinary Graduate Faculty Groups.**

In accordance with the appointment of Graduate Faculty at the University of Maine as outlined in the Constitution, the Graduate School may establish interdisciplinary groups of the Graduate Faculty. Each interdisciplinary group must develop its own bylaws describing the purpose of the group, the graduate degree program(s) to be offered by the faculty, and governance processes to be implemented. The faculty bylaws shall be reviewed by the Graduate Board, and upon approval of the Board, the interdisciplinary graduate group will be recognized by the Graduate School .

Interdisciplinary graduate faculty groups may develop new graduate certificate programs, master's degree programs, or doctoral programs or may develop concentrations within the existing Interdisciplinary Doctor of Philosophy program. Such programs will be reviewed by the Graduate Board periodically to ensure that they are meeting their stated goals. With the recommendation of the Graduate Board, the Executive Vice President and Provost may terminate any concentration offered under the Interdisciplinary Doctor of Philosophy program.

Roger King moved and Jim McClymer seconded.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **December 18, 2002 Motions**

##### **Motion on Homeless Faculty**

###### **Motion**

Effective immediately, all regular, tenure-track faculty appointments must be made in an existing academic department or school. In the case of the College of Education and Human Development where there are no departments, appointments are made in the College. Further, the standard procedures for formulating a peer committee, as addressed in departmental promotion and tenure criteria and, if appropriate, criteria for joint appointment, need to be followed for all faculty appointments. The department, or a designated committee must approve the appointment by a majority vote.

The Executive Vice President/Provost will begin discussions immediately with the appropriate deans to secure regular departmental affiliations for all tenure-track faculty currently holding interdisciplinary appointments. The department, or a designated committee must approve the appointment by a majority vote.

##### **Motion on Peer Committees for Joint Appointments**

###### **Motion**

For tenure and promotion of faculty with joint appointments, peer committees consisting of peers from the department(s) and/or unit(s) in which the faculty member holds the appointment must be appointed by the home academic department chair in consultation with the other department chair(s) or center director(s). The Peer Committee selects its chair annually from among the committee membership. For the purposes of this policy, the College of Education and Human Development, the Cooperative Extension, and all Schools are equivalent to an academic unit/department. Except as noted below<sup>1</sup>, equal number of faculty members from each unit participating in the joint appointment shall be



selected to form the joint peer committee, but tenure resides only in academic departments. The peer committee makes its recommendation to the chair of the home academic department and the chair(s) or director(s) of the other department or center. The chair of the academic department and/or center forwards her/his recommendation to the appropriate dean(s). Research center directors forward recommendations to the Dean(s) and Associate Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School who send their recommendations to the Executive Vice President and Provost. After review and discussion by the Administrative Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, the Executive Vice President and Provost forwards his/her recommendation to the President for action.

For joint appointments between the College of Natural Sciences , Forestry, and Agriculture and the University of Maine Cooperative Extension , joint peer committee membership will continue to be proportional to the percentage appointment in the two units.

Motion to amend the Constitution of the Faculty Senate regarding the composition of the Committee on Committees.

## Preamble

It is difficult to find ten faculty members to take an active part in the Committee on Committees. As a result, the Committee on Committees frequently operates without a full complement of members. The purpose of this motion is to bring the constitution into alignment with current practice.

## Motion

To amend Article VII. Section 2 of the Constitution of the Faculty Senate as shown below:

**Section 2. The Committee on Committees.** Except for the Committee on Committees, in consultation with the appointed Chair, the Senate President will appoint the members of each standing committee. In appointing members, the Senate President will consider the need to balance membership continuity with new members in a given year. Committee membership is for one year, with the possibility of reappointment. The Committee on Committees, elected by the Senate, will consist of ten **one faculty Senate member from each college, one faculty Senate member from the University of Maine Cooperative Extension and the Graduate Student Association Representative to the faculty Senate.** The faculty members shall reflect the proportional representation to each college on the Senate, with provision that each participating college and CES shall have at least one member. It shall be the responsibility of the President, Vice President/President-elect, and the Secretary to determine the number of positions to be allocated to each college. The Committee on Committees shall, at the request of the University President or designee, recommend faculty members to standing and ad hoc administrative committees or shall provide a list to the President or designee of faculty members who have agreed to serve on a specific committee.

**NOTE: Suggested changes to the text are shown in bold for reference. Existing wording, shown as a redaction, are for reference only.**

## Motion on Graduate Students' Child Care Subsidies

### Preface

The Department of Human Services (DHS) provides money to the University of Maine Children's Center for childcare subsidies, which they make available to all undergraduate students, faculty, and employees of the University – everyone, except graduate students. The DHS rule allows people to get multiple baccalaureate degrees and still remain eligible for the DHS subsidies; however, upon entry into the graduate level, eligibility ceases. Furthermore, employees of the University of Maine who would otherwise be eligible for these subsidies, but whose spouse or partner are Graduate Students are ineligible.

Mr. Newell Auger from DHS left an explanation of the DHS rule on a graduate student's voice mail on 21 November 2002 . The transcribed explanation states: "there are many people who need the subsidy that have not had the privilege of obtaining a GED, much less a Bachelor or Masters Degree." Mr. Auger went on to say: "People fortunate enough to obtain a college education should be out in the work force taking advantage of their earning potential." It appears Mr. Auger, as representative of the DHS, is unaware of the economic contribution that graduate work, through Research and Development, has to the State of Maine .

The Association of Graduate Students (AGS) is outraged by this unfair rule that singles out and discriminates against one segment of the population. The AGS has passed a resolution asking that the rule be changed. Eligibility should be distributed based on financial need rather than some arbitrary definition of "privilege".

## Motion

The Faculty Senate of the University of Maine , in support of the Association of Graduate Students, requests that President Hoff write a letter to the appropriate State Legislative officials, to request that the Department of Human Services change its rules, to make graduate students and their partners eligible to apply for childcare subsidies.

## Motion On Faculty Input Into The Budgeting Process

### Preamble

The budget is a primary document of planning and accountability for the University of Maine . Input into the budgeting process by affected stakeholders allows for more effective budgeting, and better buy-in. While faculty do not have direct budgetary responsibility, they are directly and significantly impacted by decisions that are reflected in the budget. In addition, in the spirit of shared governance, faculty have a responsibility to monitor institutional progress toward stated goals.

## Motion

Faculty at the University of Maine will be given the opportunity to review the budget before it becomes final to state concerns, ask questions and make suggestions. This will be accomplished by the following process

- A copy of the proposed budget will be made available to faculty on the Faculty Conference in FirstClass at least one month prior to the time it is due at the system.
- In the week following the week in which the proposed budget became available, at least one meeting will be scheduled so interested faculty will have the opportunity to discuss the budget with the Vice President for Administration.
- The time and place of the meeting will be widely announced at least five days prior to the meeting. At a minimum an announcement will be posted on the Faculty Conference in FirstClass and the President of the Faculty Senate will be notified. It will be the President's responsibility to further notify faculty via e-mail and/or an announcement in Faculty Senate.
- The budget in its finalized form will also be made available to faculty on the Faculty Conference in FirstClass.

### **Motion on Workload Evaluation**

#### **Preamble:**

The Faculty Senate welcomes the Administration's attention to Workload Evaluation, but has serious concerns about how it has taken form, and also how the metric looks only at teaching hours without any consideration of the total mission of the University and its faculty, in particular, in research and service. The composition of the formula itself raises many questions of oversights in recognizing teaching loads, and of how it weighs courses with no attention to the specific needs of disciplines in structuring them. The numbers run on this metric have raised concerns themselves, for they do not match those run by several departments and other academic units. Linked issues, such as the new permission forms for teaching overload courses have likewise caused distrust of the faculty towards this implementation.

#### **Motion:**

The Faculty Senate requests that the Administration work with the Faculty to discuss the following issues before taking any further actions on Workload Evaluation.

- 1.) The need for clearly stated, mission based goals driving Workload Evaluation.
- 2.) The need for clarification of how Workload formulations will coordinate within current budgets, changes ensuing from the Incentivized Budget, and the objectives of the Strategic Plan.
- 3.) The need to ensure that Workload formulations will support disciplines in defining and effectively implementing their curricula.
- 4.) The need for Workload formulations to match the criteria of faculty member evaluation by his or her Peer Committee.
- 5.) The need to ensure that teaching Workloads truly complement research and service components.
- 6.) The need for open, public records of faculty Workload assignments.
- 7.) The need to identify how the University will assess the outcomes of its Workload Evaluations, particularly in relation to the expected outcomes of the University.
- 8.) The need to scrutinize University commitments outside of academic programs for the contribution to the University mission, since the academic programs constitute only one-quarter of the University's budget, yet generate most tuition and significant research, which comprise the principal reason for the state's funding of the University.
- 9.) The need for other means of Workload evaluation, such as accreditation recommendations and comparisons to the effectiveness of like academic units at other universities, to assess performance and reallocate resources.

### **January 29, 2003 Motions**

#### **Motion on Outcomes Assessment**

##### **Preamble**

The New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), our campus' accrediting body, directed President Hoff on October 19, 1999, to prepare a 5<sup>th</sup> year interim report for consideration in Spring 2004. In this report, the University of Maine must "give emphasis to" four specific goals, one of which is "implementing measures to assess student learning outcomes in both general education and the undergraduate major, and using the resulting findings for the improvement of academic programs." In short, NEASC requires that the University of Maine conduct a data-driven process of instructional improvement. The following motion calls on the administration and faculty to work together to carry out this mandate.

##### **Motion**

The Faculty Senate recommends that the University Administration, in cooperation with the Faculty Senate's Academic Affairs Committee, the Undergraduate program Curriculum Committee (UPCC), the Center for Teaching Excellence, other appropriate campus bodies, and the individual faculty members who teach courses approved for general education requirements, undertake a process to assess student learning outcomes in general education with the greater goal of improving teaching and learning on our campus. The Faculty Senate's Academic Affairs Committee is charged to monitor actions taken with respect to this task and prepare a progress report to be submitted to the Faculty Senate no later than December 2003.

## **Motion on Shared Governance-Michael Grillo University Environment**

### **Preface**

The spirit of Shared Governance has played a substantial role at the University of Maine in creating major documents such as the Strategic Plan, staffing committees, hiring of administrators, forging new interdisciplinary initiatives, and in the welcome cooperation between the Administration, the Faculty Senate, and other faculty groups in crafting university policies. Recognizing that only through cooperation among the different branches of the University of Maine can we work effectively to serve our essential mission in teaching, research, and public outreach, as the land-grant university of the State of Maine, the Faculty Senate wishes to formalize discussions and processes ensuring greater Shared Governance.

### **Motion**

In the spirit of its responsibilities defined by its Constitution, the Faculty Senate embraces the notion of Shared Governance at all levels of the University, so that it may continue to refine its goals as the land-grant, comprehensive, doctoral institution of the State of Maine and to fulfill them effectively. As the representative body of the faculty, we encourage other sectors of the University to engage with us and the Administration in developing Shared Governance, to include the appropriate voices of professional, clerical, and all other members of the University so that we may better address how we meet our challenges as a unified community.

The great longevity of faculty members in their dedication to the University allows us to best ensure the continuity necessary to build upon our historical strengths, and guarantee the lasting success of current and future initiatives. The Senate recommends that the Administration always include the faculty for full participation in identifying, originating, developing, staffing, and evaluating all University initiatives, academic policies, budgeting decisions, administrative positions, major actions, and policies. We ask the Administration to commit itself to faculty participation in all of these decisions and actions, and also to work with us in establishing dialogues with representatives of the other members of the University Community to work for their inclusion in these decisions and actions as well.

### **February 26, 2003 Motions**

Howard Patterson presented the first motion brought forward by the Academic Affairs Committee. Advising differs in the different colleges, as does the retention rate for first- and second-year students. This motion urges the administration and faculty to make student retention a top priority. Bryan Pearce moved and Michael Grillo seconded the motion.

### **Motion on Student Retention**

#### **PREAMBLE**

The University of Maine has the lowest retention rate (First Year students returning for their sophomore and junior years) of any New England Land Grant University. Some factors contributing to this outcome are beyond our institution's control (e.g., relatively low income levels of Maine families, relatively small population base within commuting distance, relative geographic isolation from major population centers). However, other factors are within our control, and we should attempt to address them. Two major factors are the quality of advising and the level of academic engagement, especially for First Year and sophomore students.

The quality of academic advising students receive varies greatly, especially for First Year and sophomore students. Students in the first two years of study are frequently uncertain about their choice of major, often switch majors, take relatively few courses in their majors, and take many classes outside their majors with large numbers of students. All of these situations make it difficult for students to connect with their assigned advisors in their majors. These students need access to more consistent advising that will help them find and achieve success in the best program of study for them within the university. The advising center in the College of Education and Human Development, which advises First year and Sophomore students, has been successful in raising the retention rate of students initially enrolled in that college.

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) has gathered data indicating that full-time students at our university spend an average of 14 hours per week studying outside of class, with the largest number of students reporting that they spent only 6-10 hours per week studying outside of classes. While these results are similar to findings for doctoral/research universities nationwide, they are still cause for concern. The Institutional Studies office also reports evidence of a high rate of absenteeism in larger classes.

#### **MOTION**

The Faculty Senate urges the administration and faculty to designate increasing the retention rate of students in the first two years of study as a top institutional priority. Specifically, the Faculty Senate encourages colleges which do not currently have advising centers for their majors to study the need for creation of such centers, targeted to First Year and sophomore students. Further, the Faculty Senate urges all faculty to make efforts to increase student academic engagement by increasing (a) opportunities for active learning experiences during classes, (b) opportunities for students to engage in small group learning experiences both inside and outside of regular class times, (c) regular homework assignments with clear connections to both classroom instruction and course assessments, and/or (d) opportunities for academic engagement with students beyond the classroom through such activities as field trips, student societies, honor societies, lecture series, colloquia, etc.. Finally, the Faculty Senate urges the administration to adopt a regular schedule for the administration and analysis of NSSE to assist us in monitoring and improving the level of student engagement on our campus.

#### **Discussion:**

John Beacon distributed statistics on student retention that show that UMaine does better within the System for both retention and graduate rates. He pointed out that the retention rate fluctuates within two percent. One senator asked why U.S.M.'s graduation rate is lower, and President Hoff answered. He suggested that because of the number of part-time students there, a 6-year graduation rate is unreasonable.

Moreover, that rate is hard to calculate with students' transferring in and out. One can count really only those who start and finish here at UMaine. He is not against the resolution, and no matter what the rate, we can do better. Howard Patterson said that emails to him show that faculty are in support of this motion. Darlene Bay expressed concern about having professional advisors because it decreases faculty contact with students. Howard Patterson clarified the motion, saying that each college has the freedom to improve interaction between faculty and students any way it wants. Some colleges do very well while others do not. The issue of rewarding advising was raised. Darlene Bay feels very strongly that teaching has to be highly valued. Until it is, we're not going to improve retention. It was pointed out that resources for teaching at this campus will need to be increased in order to do (b), (c), and (d) of the motion.

**Vote:** 28 in favor, 4 opposed, 12 abstentions. The motion was passed.

Howard Patterson introduced the second motion from the Academic Affairs Committee, which calls for continued printing of the catalog until all, i.e. parents, students, and faculty, are fully comfortable with the electronic form.

### **Motion Regarding Printing of the University Catalog**

#### **PREAMBLE**

Discussions are under way to do away with the printed format of the University Catalog, citing printing expenses and the speed with which the catalog becomes obsolete. Faculty response encompassed a wide range of concerns. Primary among these was the perceived difficulty of utilizing electronic formats for promotional purposes, specifically discussions with prospective students and their parents. Most faculty were not comfortable with the notion of having to gather people around the computer screen to look at the catalog, and many faculty noted that the relevant systems to support electronic access experience frequent outages. A number of faculty also thought that prospective students and their parents would like a printed copy of the catalog to take with them for reference, and that it is still premature to assume that all families would have convenient access to electronic materials, whether on the internet or on CD. Finally, the faculty also expressed concern about the idea that the printed catalog to some extent forms a contract with students that is identifiable to some period in time, and the very ease with which online resources can be updated also makes them inconstant in terms of forming a consistent body of expectations and regulation.

#### **MOTION**

The Faculty Senate recommends that a limited number of printed copies of the catalog be issued for promotional and reference purposes. The number printed should be based on (1) the number of student requests per year, (2) an additional number to be housed in the primary administrative units for academic reference such as College and Departmental offices and (e) an allotment, based on a complete poll, for individual faculty who need a printed copy. The Senate further recommends that materials used to solicit inquiries about the University's programs allow the prospects to indicate whether they would prefer to receive electronic or printed materials, thereby further reducing the demand for printed copies over time.

#### **Discussion:**

Matt Rodrigue indicated that ten of the fifteen student leaders are in favor of keeping the printed catalog for advising and individual perusal, though they understand the need to cut costs. Michael Grillo asked how much the savings would be if printing were discontinued. John Beacon said that 15,000-16,000 catalogs are printed annually at \$3.00 each, plus postage. The total is anywhere from \$50,000 to \$70,000 a year. He added that some guidance counselors prefer to have the printed copy on their desk for easy reference.

Jim Horan expressed concern that if the catalog is cut further and printed copies are given only to faculty, prospective students will not get them, and they should. Tom Brann pointed out that paper copies allow high school guidance counselors to compare different institutions when they're advising students. Michael Grillo reiterated the concern that Web DSIS crashes when the system is taxed. Will the savings from cutting out the printed catalog guarantee access and computational power? John Beacon replied, saying that the catalog will still be printed. Christa Schwintzer raised the issue of ancient computers, which are also a problem if they don't allow access to Web DSIS.

Jim Warhola made a friendly amendment to the motion to keep class lists accessible. Michael Grillo seconded the amendment. Howard Patterson stated the need to take care of this issue first and indicated that the committee would be happy to address class lists and other related documents. Jim Warhola withdrew the friendly amendment.

Jim Horan indicated that he was going to vote in favor of the motion because it's half a loaf. He added, however, that if enrollment goes down, we'll have lost a lot of what we've gained thanks to efforts by faculty, staff, and President Hoff to build enrollment. Dorothy Klimis-Zacas pointed out that some universities charge for their catalogs.

**Voting Result:** 45 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions. The motion was passed.

### **March 26, 2003 Motions**

#### **Request to Continue Important Services**

##### **Preamble:**

The administration has indicated that they intend to eliminate a number of services as a cost savings measure and replace them by electronic means. While the faculty generally embraces the use of technology to enhance our work, the technology is not yet to the point where it can replace the printed word.

The decision to stop providing class lists is a shifting of clerical task onto faculty. Low cost centralized printing is to be replaced with local printing at a much higher cost per page. Not all teachers have, or should have, access to DSIS and the printing of class lists. This is a particular issue where

classes or laboratories are taught by teaching assistants and adjuncts.

The printed schedule of classes has a higher bandwidth than any electronic form. It allows students and faculty to work together efficiently to plan class schedules.

The record of the online versions of the schedule of classes, general education lists and DSIS to handle the loads is poor. Until such time as the advantages of electronic delivery can be clearly demonstrated, hardcopy of important documents should continue.

**Motion:**

Request that the administration work with faculty senate (or designated subcommittee) to ensure that useful services, such as delivered hardcopy of class lists and printed copies of schedules of classes, that further the academic mission of the university are maintained and enhanced.

Further more, the administration should solicit faculty input to improve the operation and user friendliness of WEB DSIS and successor software such as PeopleSoft .

Jim McClymer moved and John Maddaus seconded. Laura Cowan asked if the class schedule for next year would be printed. It will be available on April 1.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed 38 for and 1 against.

## **Motion: Creation of a Policy Handbook for the University of Maine**

### **Preamble**

Policies, administrative practices and directives are in place that governs various aspects of employment at the University of Maine . These guidelines can be found in manuals, on web-sites and in handbooks. Of concern to the faculty senate is that there is no central source for the collection of documents that govern common practices that affect faculty members, the faculty-student interaction, resource allocation and other salient aspects of faculty service to the University. Although change to our governing policies and practices is, and should be, rare, there is no general protocol by which changes are disseminated through the community, nor are historical records of changes maintained by some offices within the University. The motion, detailed below, supports the creation of a central repository of policies, practices and directives that govern faculty, the faculty student interaction and resource allocation. Under the motion, a standardized protocol for the dissemination of changes to policies, practices and directives will be developed and a historical record of changes maintained.

### **Motion**

The purpose of this motion is to create a web-based policy handbook. Policies, Administrative Practice letters, and directives that govern faculty members, the interaction of faculty members with students and resource allocations that affect faculty members, shall be gathered in a central, accessible repository. Within the handbook, files will be maintained that allow changes to policies to be monitored. The campus community will be notified of changes to policies via an agreed upon protocol.

While the content of the central repository is expected to be dynamic, the basic repository shall be developed in a timely manner and completed no later than March, 2004.

Michael Grillo moved and Jim McClymer seconded. Christa Schwintzer asked about the relationship of the faculty handbook to this motion. Bob Rice replied that the handbook would be a subset of this larger collection. Dorothy Klimas-Zacas asked who would do that actual work.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed unanimously.

## **Motion to Support Return of Indirect Cost to Fogler Library**

### **Preamble**

The University of Maine Fogler Library and its research collections are critical for the success of research in the state of Maine . Currently, the Library is seriously under-funded, and one of the things that are hardest hit by this are the journals, other serials, and books that scientists and other scholars need to support their research.

According to the indirect cost ("overhead") agreement negotiated with the Federal government, 1% of the indirect costs is to support the Library. Provost Kennedy has recently agreed, in principle, to earmark 1% of the indirect costs recovered (IRC) for the Library above and beyond the amount currently budgeted for the Library, subject to budgetary needs. This is good news indeed, and we applaud the Administration for this initiative, yet it does not go far enough. In the present budgetary climate, this 1% cannot be allocated. Also, 1% of the IRC is insufficient to support the research collections of the Library that support the University's research efforts.

The Library needs this money as soon as possible, possibly even at the expense of other worthy uses for the IRC. The Library also needs additional funds, and the money generated by grants seems a logical place from which to obtain them. We understand that the IRC agreement may not be modified until the next negotiations with the Federal government.

### **Motion**

Be it resolved that:

1. The Faculty Senate fully endorses the Provost's plan to earmark 1% of the indirect cost recovered to the Library for acquisitions to support research collections.

2. The Faculty Senate strongly urges that this money be given to the Library immediately.
3. The Administration, at the time of the next negotiation with the Federal government about indirect costs, negotiates a higher percent of the indirect costs to go to support the Library, and that these funds are so directed.
4. The Administration establish additional “earmarks” from revenue sources (such as the comprehensive fee) to help ensure appropriate future funding of scholarly materials.

John Maddaus moved and Don Hayes seconded. Dorothy Klimas-Zacas asked what “immediately” means. David Batuski replied that this plan was formerly in place but was removed during the current budget crunch. Gregory White wondered if increasing the overhead rate would hamper the ability of researchers to get grants. David Batuski replied that 1% is insufficient and needs to be rethought. Robert Kennedy explained that the rate is negotiated at the system level and that the University of Mainemight not be able to impact the negotiations. Our rate is currently 47%. Funded research is currently increasing. Don Hayes asked how our rate compares to that of other research institutions. Robert Kennedy replied that a rate of 45% to 49% is considered high. Todd Cole asked what the 1% is applied to. It is 1% of the total overhead amount. John Maddaus asked where the rest goes. Robert Kennedy replied that it is used for equipment, maintenance and utilities and Dana Humphrey noted that the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs maintains an online list. David Batuski stated that this motion calls for the first firm earmarking of funds for the library.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed with 38 for and 2 abstentions.

## **Motion on Transfers and Credits**

### **Preamble**

There is a discrepancy in University policy with regard to evaluation of internal and external transcripts for transfer purposes. This discrepancy allows students from other institutions to transfer only courses which meet certain criteria, most notably a grade of C or better. In contrast, internal transfers are presently limited only to the possibility of losing credit for all work completed, irrespective of level of performance in individual courses. It is possible that such an all-or-none approach to transcript reevaluation may discourage some students from pursuing or succeeding in a new program or major. In order to address this present inequity with regard to our own students, we propose the following addition and change to the present policy (present policy in italics).

### **Motion**

The Faculty Senate recommends the following alternative procedure be included in the University policy on transcript evaluation:

Transcript Reevaluation:

Once during a student’s association with the university his or her transcript may be reevaluated if certain conditions are met. This can only occur following one of the actions listed below:

- Return to the university following suspension or dismissal
- Completing a successful semester on provisional continuation
- Changing academic majors or colleges within the University
- Entering a transitional program
- Returning to the University after withdrawal from it

If one or more of these conditions is met, the student’s dean may exclude from the calculation of the student’s

accumulative grade point average all grades (including passing grades) received during one or more semester(s) immediately prior to the qualifying program change. For purposes of this policy, any courses taken outside normal term dates (running start or any courses attached to a fall or spring semester) will be treated as part of a separate semester. When a transcript is reevaluated, the dean may waive required courses in which passing grades were received (so that students need not repeat them) but neither the grades(s) nor the credit(s) for those courses count toward graduation or the computation of the accumulative GPA.

Alternatively, if one or more of the above conditions is met, the student’s dean may elect to exclude from the calculation of the student’s accumulative grade point average and credits only courses and grades which would not be required by the student’s new major or by General Education requirements received during one or more semester(s) immediately prior to the qualifying program change and for which the grade received was less than a C. Thus, the grades of courses which fulfill major or General Education requirements would continue to be included in the calculation of the accumulative GPA unless they are repeated.

Jim McClymer moved and Phyllis Brazee seconded. Marie Hayes asked how this policy relates to measures other schools are taking to promote retention. Howard Patterson replied that this is an attempt to help students to do well. Alla Gamarnik asked what would happen to students with no declared major who wished to use this policy. Howard Patterson replied that the motion gives the deans flexibility in how they handle any situation. Mary Ellen Symanski noted that application of the policy could be expensive for the student. Matthew Broderick said that student senate has discussed the issue and has considered the possibility of that the result will be a watering down of grades and an erosion of the creditability of the institution. However, the student senate concluded that the policy provides a valuable opportunity for students and it was passed unanimously. John Maddaus if courses with acceptable grades can stay on the record and it was confirmed that they can. Christa Schwintzer noted that a major concern was with student satisfaction. Bryan Pearce believes that the motion rewards failure—why, then, limit it to changes of major, and why not just throw out any bad grade? Doug Gelinas noted that the courses would not be completely expunged from the record; they would just be removed from the computation of the GPA. Christa Schwintzer stated that courses can be repeated to remove a single bad grade.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed with 28 for, 2 against and 8 abstentions.

### **April 16, 2003 Motions**

#### **Reauthorization Of The Interdisciplinary Studies Committee For The Academic Year 2003–2004 As An Ad Hoc Committee Of The Faculty Senate**

##### **Preamble:**

Whereas interdisciplinary endeavors in teaching, research, and service have become an integral aspect of the University of Maine's activity in all three stated missions of teaching, research, and public service, and

Whereas the current Strategic Plan of the University of Maine places particularly strong emphasis on the further development of interdisciplinary endeavors at the University of Maine, and

Whereas the Faculty Senate anticipates and welcomes an expansion of interdisciplinary endeavors at the University of Maine, and

Whereas the Faculty Senate foresees an increasing role for itself in the encouragement, guidance, and development of those endeavors,

##### **Motion**

Be it moved that the Faculty Senate re-authorize the Interdisciplinary Studies Committee to continue as an Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate for academic year 2003 – 2004, and

Be it further moved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the incoming Faculty Senate for academic year 2003-2004 take the necessary steps to change status of the Interdisciplinary Studies Committee to a Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Phyllis Brazee moved and John Maddaus seconded. Martha Broderick suggested that the two parts of the motion be decoupled. The second part of the motion was thus deleted and left to be enacted by next year's faculty senate.

**Voting Result:** The motion, as amended passed unanimously.

#### **Motion to Reauthorize the Workload Evaluation Committee**

##### **Preface:**

Over this year, the Administration has begun to examine workloads across the campus. The Faculty Senate, after raising several issues about the needs for, the means of conducting, the means of evaluating the outcomes of, the legal ramifications of, and the consistency across different campus units of such an analysis, asked that the Administration work with the Faculty by authorizing a Workload Evaluation Committee. This faculty committee has been recently organized and just begun to undertake its work.

##### **Motion:**

The Faculty Senate reauthorizes the Workload Evaluation Committee for continuation through the coming 2003-2004 academic year, so that they may continue in their exploration of workload issues with the Administration and prescribe implementations of their well-reasoned findings.

Michael Grillo moved and Thomas Brann seconded.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed unanimously.

#### **Motion to Adopt the Faculty Handbook dated April 2003**

##### **Preamble**

The last version of the Faculty Handbook, that the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (C&BLC) could find, was published in July 1983. Those of you on the faculty then who can still remember anything, might recall that this is about the same time as the beginning of AFUM. Thus, for all practical purposes, the collective bargaining agreement became the Faculty Handbook. And, for all practical purposes, it is still the de facto handbook. Presumably, that is why no one bothered to update the handbook for twenty years. We will not ask the question, "Why, after twenty years, do we suddenly need a handbook"?

The New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEAS&C) is the university's accrediting body and section 5.10 of their Standards for Accreditation state:

"In a faculty handbook or in other written documents that are current and readily available, the institution clearly defines the responsibilities of faculty and the criteria for their recruitment, appointment, evaluation, and promotion. Such policies are equitable and compatible with the mission and purposes of the institution; they provide for the fair redress of grievances, and they are consistently applied and periodically reviewed."

The issues described in section 5.10 by NEAS&C are largely covered by the AFUM collective bargaining agreement. Nevertheless, the C&BLC has undertaken to prepare a Faculty Handbook that will provide useful information to the faculty, primarily new faculty members. Whenever a topic, such as grievances, is either not covered in or is in conflict with the collective bargaining agreement, the new faculty handbook defers in a disclaimer.

The handbook is intended as a “living” electronic document. The C&BLC will be charged with updating the handbook on a once-per-semester basis. Minor changes such as typos or updating URL’s will be made on an ad hoc basis whereas substantive changes will be brought to the attention of the senate. The handbook will be placed on the University Policy Website.

The handbook in question is the version labeled, “Faculty handbookFinal\_2.pdf”, which has been distributed, via email, to all senate members labeled.

### **Motion**

The faculty senate adopts as a Faculty Handbook the document “Faculty handbookFinal\_2.pdf” that has been distributed to all faculty\_senate members. This handbook will be a “living” electronic document and is intended to be a useful reference for faculty members. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee will be charged with updating the handbook on a once-per-semester basis. Minor changes such as typos or updating URL’s will be made on an ad hoc basis, whereas substantive changes will be brought to the attention of the senate. The handbook will be placed on the University Policy Website.

This handbook is not intended to replace the AFUM collective bargaining agreement. Furthermore, it is the understanding of all involved that the AFUM collective bargaining agreement takes precedence whenever a topic is either not covered in or is in conflict with the new faculty handbook.

Jim Horan moved and Jim McClymer seconded. It was noted that this motion may require that the constitution be updated to reflect the new responsibility of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. Jim Horan stressed that the collective bargaining agreement and the handbook are two different documents.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed with 48 for and 1 abstention.

### **Motion on University of Maine Conflict of Interest Policy**

#### **Preface:**

Kassie Stevens Walker’s memo of 13 March, 2003, to all employees of the University on the University’s Conflict of Interest Policy has occasioned concern that, unless clarified, it will have a chilling effect on freedom of speech of University employees.

#### **Motion:**

The Faculty Senate asks the President to reaffirm the University’s academic freedom and free speech policies as articulated in the Faculty Handbook and in the rules governing electronic communication, and to concur that the conflict of interest memo of 13 March, 2003, is not intended to restrict use of electronic media for non-commercial communications or expression of opinion, on or off campus, and that all members of the University community are encouraged to continue to engage in free, public expression of their views on any subject, in electronic and other media, consistent with Article 2 of the AFUM contract.\*

\*Unit members as citizens are entitled to the rights of citizenship in their roles as citizens. Because of their special status in the community, unit members have a responsibility and an obligation to indicate when expressing personal opinions that they are not institutional representatives unless specifically authorized as such.

Mike Howard moved and Roger King seconded. Mike Howard stressed that it needs to be made clear that the University administration has no intention of restricting freedom of speech and expression of the faculty and staff as citizens.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed unanimously.

### **Motion: Administrative Training for the Faculty**

#### **Preface:**

Established in their long-term commitment to the University, the faculty offer a deep, historical knowledge of the University’s strengths and potentials for improvement. To promote greater institutional continuity and stability, the University of Maine should offer the opportunity to prepare interested faculty members for positions in its administration.

#### **Motion:**

The Faculty Senate asks that the Administration establish a program that will prepare interested faculty members for current and envisioned administrative positions. To this end, the University should establish a committee of faculty members and administrators who would design an effective training program, select recommended or self-nominated faculty members interested in administrative training, place them in appropriate programs and internships, and monitor the success of their training. In preparation for establishing a formal program for training faculty members for administrative roles, this committee first should survey the diverse models for training faculty members in administrative roles that several of our colleges and other units currently offer, and also look to models at other institutions. The committee should promote its program actively, so that the faculty can stay apprised of the opportunities it offers.

Faculty members most typically enter into an administrative capacity as department chairperson, so the dedicated committee should devote attention specifically to their preparation for this important role. The new committee should also focus on developing faculty members for other leadership positions, for instance, for chairs of committees such as the UPCC and the colleges’ Academic Councils. As the Administration anticipates other positions opening up, either extant or new ones, it should notify the committee so that they can contact appropriately trained candidates from the faculty of the opportunities.



Mary Ellen Symanski moved and Phyllis Brazee seconded. The intention of the motion is to provide the training to interested faculty that will allow them to move to administrative positions. The committee would identify and enlist faculty who are interested and work with the administration to help them develop necessary skills for an administrative position. Doug Ruthven was unclear about what is going to be done. Michael Grillo explained would be prepared for administrative positions before taking them on and before problems develop that need to be addressed on an ad hoc basis. In addition, there is currently no central clearinghouse keeping information about which faculty have administrative skills. This initiative would help put people into the administration that have a long-term commitment to and knowledge of the University. Doug Ruthven asked if everyone was to become an administrator.

Roger King asked if the committee would be serving a gatekeeper function to keep some people out of administration. Michael Grillo stated that it would rather serve as a lens to focus attention on faculty with administrative potential. Stellos Tavantzis asked what effect there would be on a department that is currently electing a new chair. Michael Grillo replied that it would provide the new chair with resources for meeting the new challenge. Christa Schwintzer asked who would do the training. Michael Grillo answered that the committee would look to see what is currently available, would review the national literature to see what has worked on other campuses and would lobby the administration for funding for appropriate programs.

John Maddaus stated that the motion is important and provides an opportunity for those who are interested. Bryan Pearce asked who would decide the participants and if some people who be put on the fast track. Michael Grillo stated that the intention was not to create stars, and that the means of determining who can participate given too much interest would have to be determined by the committee. Don Hayes noted that membership on the committee is rotating so no problem of unfair or limited opportunities would arise. Marie Hayes asked if individuals could self-nominate and was assured they could. Kathleen March asked if this was a mentoring program or an attempt to make the administration aware of interested faculty. Michael replied that both were goals.

Kim McKeage suggested that the Center for Teaching Excellence could be used to provide workshops and mentors. Robert Kennedy stated that mentoring and faculty development were both excellent ideas. He does have some concerns about the committee: we need broader involvement across campus in nominating faculty for national and campus award. Michael Grillo replied that he would prefer not to have the purpose of the motion diluted. Robert Kennedy replied that the motion would not preclude such activities and Michael Grillo replied that it could even be a lever to encourage it. Stellos Tavantzis noted that activists are not always the best leaders, so taking volunteers might not be the best way to recruit potential administrators. Michael Grillo responded that the committee would work to find good people from whatever source.

**Voting Result:** The motion passed 22 for, 14 against and 10 abstentions.

#### **Nominations and election of new Faculty Senate Vice President/President Elect, Senate Secretary, and Committee on Committees.**

Bryan Pearce has asked Stellos Tavantzis to be Secretary next year.

Nominations were opened for a vice president/president elect for next year. Dorothy Klimas-Zacas nominated Howard Patterson. Jim Horan moved that nominations cease. Howard was elected wit:

**Voting Result:** 48 for and 2 abstentions.

## **2001 – 2002 Motions**

### **September 26, 2001 Motions**

No motions

### **October 24, 2001 Motions**

#### **Assignment of issues to committees**

##### **Preamble:**

A number of issues have proposed for consideration and action in 2001-2002, including several issues on which the Senate took some action in 2000-2001 and on which follow-up action is deemed to be required. Following discussion at the September 2001 meetings of the Elected Members Committee and the Senate, the Executive Committee sought the guidance of the members of the Senate by asking members to prioritize a list of issues. Based on consideration of the responses received, the Executive Committee moves to assign issues to committees as follows:

##### **Motion:**

The following issues are assigned to the designated committees:

- Honors College Commission report – to Academic Affairs
- Math and writing competencies – to Academic Affairs
- Campus sustainability, energy and environment – to Finance and Institutional Planning
- Budget and capital projects – to Finance and Institutional Planning
- Faculty workloads – to Finance and Institutional Planning
- Academic space and facilities – to Finance and Institutional Planning

- Student course evaluations – to University Environment
- Student retention – to University Environment
- CED faculty advisory council – to Research and Public Service
- AA degree equivalent to general education? – to General Education Review
- Process for faculty evaluations of administrators – to Executive Committee
- Definitions of faculty, units and programs of study – to Executive Committee
- “Coaches” as a separate faculty category – to Executive Committee

Bob Rice was called upon to move motion as written; it was seconded by Howard Patterson.

Kathleen March offered a friendly amendment: That the Academic Affairs Committee consider the issue of coverage of classes when faculty are absent.

John Maddaus asked for unanimous consent. Steve Cohn asked for clarification of the amendment, at which point the parliamentarian advised seeking a second for the amendment and proceeding with discussion. The amendment was seconded by Doug Ruthven.

#### **Discussion of amendment:**

K. March said that there are times when a faculty member cannot be in class, and the issue of how the class is to be covered, or if it is covered, is vague. The committee may need to consider how this is to be done.

B. Rice asked if this would be a policy that would be included in the Faculty Handbook. K. March said that she certainly sees it as appropriate for the Handbook so that the faculty will know to do the right thing.

H. Patterson asked if she could cite an example of why we are considering this now. She responded that if a faculty member must be away for professional or health reasons, it is unclear how these courses are to be covered. It may be that there are different requirements for faculty in different colleges or departments. Whether the class needs to be taught, whether assignments can be given, whether the Internet can be used to maintain communication during absence, or a VCR can be wheeled in... There are so many variations, and there may have been people who have been perceived as not teaching their classes.

D. Ruthven indicated that this is currently handled at the department level, and that he would hate to see additional bureaucracy added when the current system seems to handle it. J. Maddaus reminded the senators that this amendment is just to send the issue to committee. D. Ruthven indicated that the issue seems to be more substantive than should be covered in an amendment. B. Pearce indicated he shared D. Ruthven's concerns, and that this might make rules that might haunt us in the end.

O. Smith said he did not think that the request has to do with legislation, but rather with a topic to be considered, and so it is appropriate to send to Academic Affairs.

I. Kornfield called the question.

Vote on calling the question: 33 in favor, 5 opposed.

**Vote on amendment:** 21 in favor, 23 opposed. Amendment failed.

Discussion on main motion:

No further discussion

**Vote:** Unanimous save two abstentions. Motion carried.

#### **Reauthorization of Ad Hoc Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies**

##### **Preamble:**

The Senate created an ad hoc committee on Interdisciplinary Studies at its January 2001 meeting (see below). Raymond O'Connor conducted a number of discussions with faculty and administrators during the Spring '01 semester to seek input on the scope and mission of the committee. This work should be continued.

##### **Motion:**

To continue the work begun in Spring semester '01 on issues related to interdisciplinary programs, the Senate re-authorizes the ad hoc Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies for the 2001-02 academic year. The committee will look at programs involving teaching and/or research, both current and projected, in light of the University's Strategic Plan. This committee will seek to foster interdisciplinary programs campus-wide.

Jim Warhola was asked to introduce motion, which he did. He mentioned that Raymond O'Connor (on sabbatical) has promised a report on the committee's notes from last spring.

Second by Owen Smith.

No discussion.

**Vote:** passed unanimously.

## **November 26, 2001 Motions**

No motions – meeting cancelled

## **December 12, 2001 Motions**

### **1. Motion on maintenance of technology classrooms**

#### **Submitted by the Finance and Institutional Planning Committee**

##### **Preamble**

Many of the larger classrooms on campus have been equipped with technology to assist in the creative and efficient presentation of lectures. Others have been outfitted as computer classrooms. The largest classrooms such as DPC 100 are used to teach several thousand students each week. Faculty spend hours preparing presentations that rely on the technology in the room – projectors, computers, microphones, etc. Staff and technicians from Information Technologies, Office of Student Records, and Facilities Management have worked hard to keep these facilities in good condition. However, at times projectors and computers fail and projectors have historically required long periods (weeks) to repair. When this has happened there have been extended periods when faculty have been frustrated in their efforts to present quality lectures and large numbers of students have not received the quality education they deserve. Many faculty have not known where to report problems or how to get them solved. Some equipment users leave the equipment so it cannot be used by those who follow. Faculty are not given advance warning of malfunctioning equipment and so cannot alter their lecture plans accordingly.

The following campus organizations share responsibility for maintenance of these facilities:

1. Information Technologies (John Gregory, Executive Director). Responsible for computers (Campus Networking, Andrew Moody, Manager) and projectors and microphones (AudioVisual Services, David Bagley, Multi-Media Specialist).
2. Faculty. Responsible for proper use of the equipment and reporting problems promptly when they occur.
3. Office of Student Records (Alison Cox, Director). Schedules classes in the lecture halls and classrooms. Also schedules other events when the rooms are not being used for classes. Responsible for making the rooms available for repairs.
4. Facilities Management (Anita Wihry, Executive Director of Institutional and Facilities Planning). Responsible for lights in the lecture halls and classrooms, for erecting and removing scaffolding (if needed for work on the projectors), and for unlocking buildings in the morning.

##### **Motion**

The overall goal will be to keep our technology-equipped teaching facilities (lecture halls, classrooms, and computer classrooms) in **excellent working condition**. This means that all equipment is fully functional and repairs, when needed, are made quickly (within minutes, hours, or a few days depending on the difficulty of the repair). To this end the Senate recommends that:

##### **Information Technologies**

- 1) Designate a single individual or office where problems can be reported. This person/office will quickly contact Audio Visual Services and/or Campus Networking as needed.
- 2) Place information cards on the podium with instructions for whom to call about problems and specific instructions to turn off the projectors as appropriate. Check, as needed, to ensure that the cards are still there.
- 3) Make repairs quickly. When computers malfunction a qualified technician will respond within minutes to minimize loss of valuable class time.
- 4) Keep sufficient spare parts on hand so projector bulbs and other frequently needed parts do not take weeks to obtain while the equipment cannot be used.
- 5) If a particular system cannot be repaired before the next class scheduled in the room, faculty will be notified so they can make adjustments to their lecture plans. Faculty who are scheduled in the room within three hours will be notified by telephone and e-mail. Faculty who are scheduled at a later time will be notified by e-mail.
- 6) Train faculty and other users of the equipment in the particular systems in the room they will use.
- 7) Develop step by step written instructions for the use of the equipment in each room. These instructions will be handed to everyone who receives instruction in the use of the equipment. They will include the name of the person/office where problems are to be reported.
- 8) In any lecture halls that were used over the weekend, qualified technicians will check the teaching technology and replace items on the stage (podium etc.) in their proper places on Monday morning prior to the first class.
- 9) Install a telephone in Neville 101 and other lecture halls used to teach hundreds of students to allow faculty to efficiently report problems in these large auditoriums.

10) Check overhead projectors on a regular basis and maintain as needed.

11) Include significant faculty input into the design of new classroom facilities to ensure that these facilities are easily used by ordinary faculty as well as those with advanced knowledge of technology.

12) Involve the Academic Computing Advisory Committee (ACAC) or its successor in a review of existing facilities and the design of new facilities in line with their responsibility for “helping to develop short and long range plans for the maintenance and enhancement of academic computing technologies on campus.”

#### **Faculty**

1) Obtain training in the proper use of the equipment in the rooms in which they teach.

2) Return any computer or other settings that they changed during their class to the standard settings.

3) Report any problems promptly so they can be solved before others use the room.

#### **The Office of Student Records**

Designate an individual/office to receive requests for making lecture halls and classrooms available for repairs. Making the room available may involve moving or canceling one or more scheduled events. Repairs have a very high priority because the primary function of these rooms is teaching.

#### **Facilities Management**

1) Designate an individual/office to receive requests for help with repairs and to arrange for the needed scaffolding.

2) Set up scaffolding when needed to repair projectors. This will need to be done when classes are not in session (late afternoon, early morning, or weekends).

3) Make sure that the buildings are unlocked in the morning.

### **2. Motion concerning the replacement or repair of the library steps**

Submitted by the Finance and Institutional Planning Committee

#### **Preamble**

The north face of Fogler Library and its massive limestone-framed steps serve as a focal point for the entire campus of the University of Maine. The steps also function as a stage for gatherings on the mall and are among the most widely photographed items at the University for promotion and recruiting.

Unfortunately, the limestone framing the steps is in a state of obvious decay, is shedding large chunks of stone, and has become visually unattractive. Moreover, the steps may be reaching the point where they pose a safety threat and/or are in danger of accelerated disintegration.

#### **Motion**

The steps of Fogler Library should be replaced within the next two years. If this is not possible for financial reasons, the University should make any and all reasonable efforts to protect the library steps from further decay, to mitigate hazards to the University community, and to restore their aesthetic appeal until such time as they can be replaced.

#### **January 30, 2002 Motions**

#### **Resolution from the Library Advisory Committee on Fogler Library: Kathleen March**

#### **Preamble**

The faculty, graduate students, and general university community, feeling an urgent need to improve dramatically the funding for collections of Fogler Library, have established an endowment that will demonstrate to the legislature and the State of Maine the importance of the library to the research, teaching, and service mission of the University. This fund is called the Library Fund for Excellence (hereafter LIFE). Collections are defined as books, journals, and media in any format. The Library Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate seeks full participation of the university community in contributing to the LIFE. Details on the campaign and procedures for contribution are forthcoming.

#### **Be it resolved that**

Faculty Senate champions the Library Fund for Excellence (LIFE) initiative and encourages participation.

#### **February 27, 2002 Motions**

#### **Resolution to Protect On-Campus Child Care Provided by the Children's Center**

#### **Preamble**

The University of Maine Children's Center provides high-quality child care for the campus community, including faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduates. The University provides \$243,165 of the Center's total \$718,094 (2001–2002) budget, or 33.9%, with the rest coming from fees paid by parents (33.6%), government subsidies for low-income parents (26.7%), the USDA Food Program (4.1%), the Department of Human Services funds for quality improvement (1.6%), and miscellaneous other sources (0.1%).

The recent round of budget cuts proposed by the Administration includes a 50% cut in the University's funding for the Children's Center, or 17% of the Center's total budget. This cut is much higher than the average cut to the University's funding of other programs on campus, which seem generally to be in the 2–5% range. Indeed, the Interim Chief Financial Officer recently publicly stated that he was unaware of any other program on campus whose budget the Administration proposes to cut to this extent.

The proposed cut puts the Children's Center at risk of closing, even allowing for increased fees charged to the parents. Closing or reducing the quality of the Children's Center obviously directly affects the children and parents who are associated with the Center. However, the Children's Center serves more than just those stakeholders. Much as the fire department serves the needs of more of the community than just those who require its services, so the Children's Center serves the entire campus community. Its existence serves those who might have children in the future. It serves those departments that have faculty, staff, graduate students, or undergraduates with children in the Center, since it frees those individuals from worry that impacts their performance and from lost time that they might otherwise have. It allows professors to teach classes in the summer and to meet with their graduate and undergraduate students then. It allows those researchers with children to spend their productive summer time working instead of needing to be home. Consequently, since much of the grant writing done on campus takes place during summer or is supported by research that occurs then, the Children's Center significantly contributes to the University's ability to generate external funding and high-quality research. Indeed, it is unclear if the supposed savings obtained by cutting the Center's budget outweigh the loss of indirect cost money from grants that would be lost as researchers are forced to give up grant writing in the summer. The Center is also a powerful recruiting and retention tool for the campus, both for faculty and staff and for students.

In addition, child care is widely seen, rightly or wrongly, as a women's issue. The presence or absence of high-quality, affordable child care on campus says a lot about the friendliness of the University and administration to families and women. It is extremely ill-advised from the standpoint of public opinion for the University to cut child care, especially at a time when the University needs the good will of the citizens of Maine to weather bad economic times.

### **Motion**

Whereas the proposed cut to the University's contribution to the budget of the Children's Center is disproportionately larger than the cuts proposed for other programs on campus; and

whereas the proposed cut will harm and potentially eliminate the Children's Center; and

whereas harming the Children's Center directly harms those members of the University community with children in the Center; and

whereas harming the Children's Center indirectly harms the University's core teaching and research missions; and

whereas harming the Children's Center indirectly harms the University's ability to generate external grant funding; and

whereas harming the Children's Center contributes to a chilly climate for women and young families on campus; and

whereas harming the Children's Center will signal to the citizens of Maine that the University is indifferent to the needs of women and families in the campus community:

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Maine strongly disapproves of the amount of the proposed cuts to the Children's Center budget and hereby urges the Administration to do all in its power to ensure that any reduction in the University's contribution to the Center's budget be no more than the average reduction, on a percent basis, to the University's contribution to other programs on campus.

### **March 27, 2002 Motions**

Proposed policy for vote: **Policy on Partner Accommodation** – Submitted by Peter Hoff (distributed at the full Senate meeting on 2/27/02)

**Introduction** by Peter Hoff: I have received the draft forwarded by the Domestic Partner Facilitation Committee, and I appreciate their thoughtful and conscientious work very much. Having reviewed that draft, I find it essentially acceptable, with a few edits that I applied to the draft that I am forwarding to you attached to this message. Unless the Senate objects to the attached version, I am prepared to implement it as official university policy.

The University of Maine recognizes the importance of accommodating dual career partners in attracting and retaining a quality workforce. The University community also recognizes the ways in which dual career partners can enrich the campus culture. Because dual-career partnerships often involve employment needs or opportunities across units, University-level policy is required. The following guidelines govern domestic partner accommodations at The University of Maine.

1. All candidates in a job search as well as University employees have a right to inquire about opportunities and procedures for partner hires. Equal opportunity policy dictates that such inquiries will not influence hiring or promotion decisions.

2. When any candidate or employee inquires about employment opportunities for a partner, the Chair/Director of his or her unit will request a copy of the partner's curriculum vitae and other relevant materials. This information will then be forwarded to the appropriate administrator and department/unit in which the accompanying partner is seeking employment. The Office of Equal Opportunity may also be contacted for information and assistance.

3. An accompanying partner, like any other candidate, must be systematically reviewed by the hiring department or academic unit. If that unit believes the accompanying partner has appropriate credentials and has skills that are compatible with the department's needs and mission, they may request that the accompanying partner be considered for the University's Opportunity Hire Program.

4. University policy ordinarily requires a national search for faculty and professional appointments of more than five months. The Opportunity Hire Program, however, includes a process for requesting a search waiver and/or single or multi-year financial support for highly qualified individuals who can make a unique contribution to the University and its strategic plan. Criteria for granting waiver and funding requests include:

- Qualifications of the individual proposed, including likelihood of future success (promotion and tenure, where applicable)
- Relevance of the hire to the university's strategic priorities
- Agreement of the hiring unit for the requested appointment
- Degree to which department/college funds will support the position over time
- Rationale for waiving the normal search requirement, including the employment of partners of prospective and current employees.

5. Questions about the Opportunity Hire Program should be directed to Evelyn Silver, Director of Equal Opportunity.

6. Other alternatives for partners include the following:

- A partner of a finalist in a University search may request an interview for another open University position as long as they meet the published qualifications. If a search committee chair receives such a request, the Office of Equal Opportunity should be contacted.
- Faculty partners in the same academic discipline may ask to be considered for a joint appointment. The University of Maine now has several partners who are successfully sharing one or one and one-half positions. In such cases, the concerned department must determine whether both individuals have appropriate credentials and have the potential to become tenured members of the department.
- This appointment sharing policy (see [www.maine.edu/sharedappoint.html](http://www.maine.edu/sharedappoint.html)) also applies to professional employees and administrators.
- Partners of candidates who have received tentative job offers may seek the services of the (Career Center/Human Resources/ Equal Opportunity/ the Alumni Association) in searching for appropriate employment opportunities off campus.

7. While The University of Maine recognizes the value of promoting opportunities for dual career partners, and has established these policies to help secure this value, it cannot guarantee employment to anyone simply on the basis of the policy.

### **Motion for vote: Health Insurance for Full-Time Graduate Research and Teaching Assistants – submitted by the University Environment Committee, Judy Kuhns-Hastings, Chair**

#### **Preamble**

Full-time graduate students who are appointed as graduate assistants make important contributions to the University of Maine in the areas of teaching and research. Most research programs on campus depend heavily on the work of graduate students. The minimum graduate assistant's stipend at this time is about \$9,000 for the academic year. The cost of health insurance for graduate students is \$1,100, which amounts to over 10% of their stipends. The percentage of graduate assistants who have no health insurance is 36%. The University of Maine assumes no part of the cost of health insurance as it does for other part-time employees.

#### **Motion**

The Faculty Senate moves that the University of Maine develop a policy that covers 80% of the cost of health insurance for full-time graduate students holding graduate assistantships. Cost of Graduate Assistant health insurance should be written into grants whenever conditions of granting agencies permit.

VII. Proposed Amendment to the Faculty Senate By-laws, received from the ad hoc General Education Review Committee, submitted to the Secretary of the Senate on March 21, 2002, and forwarded by him to the Chair of the Constitution and By-laws Committee, and announced in this agenda, in accordance with the By-laws, Article VI amendment:

### **Motion to amend the by-laws to create a special committee, to be called the General Education Outcomes Committee**

#### **Preamble**

The New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), which is the accreditation agency for the University of Maine, announced in Fall, 1998, that the post-secondary institutions it accredits will be required to develop student outcomes assessment plans for general education. Since then, a number of committees at the University of Maine have examined this issue, but little progress has been made. Many university faculty are familiar with outcomes assessment through professional programs accreditation procedures and/or work with K-12 schools, so the expertise exists among the faculty to make the necessary changes. Strong faculty leadership, guided by a committee of the Faculty Senate, is needed to make significant progress on this issue in time for future accreditation actions. Since the development and monitoring of student outcomes and assessments will be a long-term process, and since NEASC is seeking institutionalization of the outcomes assessment process, the creation of a

Special Committee of the Senate is an appropriate organizational change. The Special Committee will work in consultation with the Undergraduate Program Curriculum Committee and the Center for Teaching Excellence.

## **April 24, 2002 Motions**

### **Faculty Appointments: Proposed policy**

Original motion:

**Proposed policy for a vote:** FACULTY APPOINTMENTS – Submitted by Peter Hoff and Robert Kennedy (distributed at the full Senate meeting on 2/27/02, and previously discussed by Elected Members Committee on 3/6/02 and 4/10/02)

Effective immediately, all regular, tenure-track faculty appointments must be made in an existing academic department. In the case of the College of Education and Human Development where there are no departments, appointments are made in the College. Further, the standard procedures for formulating a peer committee, as addressed in departmental promotion and tenure criteria and, if appropriate, criteria for joint appointment, need to be followed for all faculty appointments.

The Executive Vice President/Provost will begin discussions immediately with the appropriate deans to secure regular departmental affiliations for all tenure-track faculty currently holding interdisciplinary appointments.

This was moved by Howard Patterson and seconded by Christa Schwintzer.

Amendment:

An amendment was offered by Bill Farthing to add “new” between “all” and “regular”, and to add a line saying that the department must approve appointment by a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. This was seconded by Bryan Pearce.

Discussion of amendment:

[Farthing:] Have already discussed the problem existing in the psych dept. Could avoid this in future by voting when admin might decide to hire someone, then place them in a dept.

**Vote on amendment:** 23 in favor, 8 opposed, 4 abstained. Amendment passed.

**Amendment:**

Irving Kornfeld offered another amendment: substitute “department or school” for “department”. Second by Andy Thomas.

Discussion of amendment:

[Dianne Hoff:] Asked about whether voting in departmentless college would be for whole college. John answered that the College of Education and Human Development operates like a department.

[Owen Smith:] Point of discussion: Given amendment language of first paragraph, the second paragraph is inappropriate.

[John Maddaus:] They are two separate issues.

**Vote on amendment:** 33 in favor, no opposed, 5 abstained. Amendment passed.

The Parliamentarian advised that we need to amend again for the second paragraph.

Bill Farthing so moved, Mike Howard seconded.

**Vote:** 27 in favor, 7 opposed, 5 abstained. Amendment passed.

**Amended motion:**

Effective immediately, all new, regular, tenure-track faculty appointments must be made in an existing academic department or school. In the case of the College of Education and Human Development where there are no departments, appointments are made in the College. Further, the standard procedures for formulating a peer committee, as addressed in departmental promotion and tenure criteria and, if appropriate, criteria for joint appointment, need to be followed for all faculty appointments. The department or school must approve the appointment by a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

The Executive Vice President/Provost will begin discussions immediately with the appropriate deans to secure regular departmental affiliations for all tenure-track faculty currently holding interdisciplinary appointments. The department or school must approve the appointment by a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

**VOTE:** 33 in favor, none opposed, 5 abstained. Motion passed.

### **Peer Committees for Joint Appointments: Proposed Policy**

**Proposed Policy** for a vote: PEER COMMITTEES FOR JOINT APPOINTMENTS – Submitted by Peter Hoff and Robert Kennedy (distributed at the full Senate meeting on 2/27/02, and previously discussed by Elected Members Committee on 3/6/02 and 4/10/02; new sentence added in bold in the handout)

All tenure-track faculty with joint appointments must have a home with an academic department. For tenure and promotion of research faculty, joint peer committees consisting of peers from the research unit and the home academic department need to be appointed by the academic department chair in consultation with the center director. No less than 50% of the joint committee shall be from the academic department. The peer committee makes its report to the department chair and the director of the research unit. The director forwards his/her recommendation to the Vice President for research. The department chair forwards his/her recommendation to the dean. In turn, the Dean and the Vice President for Research send their recommendations to the Executive Price President/Provost. After review and discussion by the Administrative Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, the EVP/Provost forwards his/her recommendation to the President for action.

Motion was made by Bill Farthing; Kathleen March seconded.

Amendment:

[Farthing:] In view of the changes in previous policy, first sentence should be eliminated. He proposed this as an amendment. Ed Ferguson seconded.

Discussion of amendment:

[Dana Humphrey:] If we eliminate the first sentence, it would start off with "For tenure and promotion of research faculty", which would make the policy apply to all research faculty, and that was not the intent.

[Provost Kennedy:] There are a couple of operative words in first sentence – if we lose words "joint appointments", that loses what it applies to.

[Farthing:] Proposed that we change the title, and modify the second line to read "tenure track research faculty".

[Parliamentarian:] This has to be a separate motion.

[Farthing:] Can the amendment be withdrawn?

[Parliamentarian:] No, it has already been seconded.

**Vote on amendment:** 2 in favor, 29 opposed, 7 abstained. **Amendment fails.**

Kim McKeage pointed out (in the form of an amendment) that the third line should read "Vice President" rather than "Price President". This does not require an amendment, and John Maddaus assured the Senate that the typo will be corrected.

[Ed Ferguson:] We still need to address Dana's point about research faculty – the first line stands alone, so we still need an amendment to only apply to tenure-track faculty.

Amendment:

[Mike Howard:] Can we include a change to the title as an amendment? [Parliamentarian agreed.] Howard so moved. There was a second by Don Hayes.

Discussion of amendment:

[Bill Farthing:] Is this supposed to apply to everyone with joint appointments?

[Bob Rice:] When this was drafted, it was the operational practice for research faculty, and Dan Dwyer drafted it. It went through many drafts, but the word "research" remained. He thinks it applies to all joint appointments.

[Keith Hutchison:] So if someone has a 25% appointment in one dept, 75% in another, they'd have 50–50 representation in each department?

[Provost Kennedy:] It could be.

[John Maddaus:] There are references to "research" in the document, so there would have to be some changes throughout.

It was pointed out that it could be tabled.

Motion to table:

Bob Rice so moved, Kim McKeage seconded.

**Vote:** 32 in favor, no opposed, one abstained. Motion is tabled.

**Motion:** Solid Waste Minimization Committee

Motion for a vote, **To Create a Solid Waste Minimization Committee**, submitted by the Finance and Institutional Planning Committee

## Preamble

During recent years earlier advances in waste minimization were lost. Currently the University is recycling only 39% of mixed office paper and magazines (includes newspaper), 54% of cardboard, and 2% of organic cafeteria waste. Since July 1, 2001 the University has had a Sustainability



Officer whose responsibilities include waste minimization. However, this one individual cannot do all the work required. At an earlier time the University had an ad hoc committee on Waste Management. In May 1999, the President Symanski sent a letter to President Hoff recommending that the Waste Committee be made permanent although the Senate had not passed a formal motion to that effect. In a letter dated 30 January 2000, President Hoff replied "Solid Waste Committee. Although there was not a formal motion on this, we concur with the sense of the Senate that the Solid Waste Committee should stand as an official committee." At present this committee does not exist.

### **Motion**

A Committee of the Administration known as the Solid Waste Minimization Committee should be established as soon as possible, but no later than September 2002, to work with the Sustainability Officer in finding ways to minimize production of solid waste and to maximize recycling of solid waste in a cost effective manner. Such solid waste includes but is not limited to paper, glass, metals, organic cafeteria waste, and other solid waste identified by the Sustainability Officer. The committee membership should include faculty and staff with expertise in relevant areas such as composting. The committee should have six members, one of whom is a member of the Faculty Senate. It should be appointed by the President in consultation with the Sustainability Officer and the President of the Faculty Senate.

Motion was introduced by Christa Schwintzer. Scott Wilkerson, the Campus Sustainability Officer, was introduced. Christa noted that there was such a committee on an ad hoc basis at one point, and Wilkerson would like the advice of a more permanent committee. The intent is that solid waste is only one responsibility of the Sustainability Officer, but it makes sense for this area to have a committee, even though President Hoff is suggesting broader committee in addition.

Motion was seconded by Roger King.

### **Discussion**

[Gregory White:] He questioned restricting this to solid waste management and asked if it is feasible for this committee to look at energy, etc., as well? He does not see a compelling reason to limit the scope.

[Schwintzer:] The logic is that the President is planning to appoint a larger committee (announced yesterday). The idea of this is that this committee would advise on this particular subset of problems.

[White:] Given that this was announced yesterday, is this the best idea?

[Schwintzer:] The Committee did discuss this, and decided to proceed.

[Wilkerson:] He said he could absolutely use the assistance and guidance. He does not know what the makeup of the new committee [that the President announced] will be like. He envisions it will look at energy, green building issues, etc. He sees smaller groups feeding information to the larger group. He does not see them as being competing or overlapping, but more as feeding each other.

**Vote:** 26 in favor, one opposed, two abstained. Motion passes.

### **May 8, 2002 Motions**

#### ***Motion for a vote: REAUTHORIZATION OF THE AD HOC INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES COMMITTEE FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2002-2003***

##### **Preamble**

Whereas interdisciplinary endeavors in teaching, research, and service continue to grow in significance in post-secondary education, and

Whereas the Strategic Plan of the University of Maine places particularly strong emphasis on the further development of interdisciplinary endeavors at the University of Maine, and

Whereas the Faculty Senate anticipates both the expansion of interdisciplinary endeavors, and an increasing role of the Faculty Senate in the encouragement and development of those endeavors,

##### **Motion**

Be it moved that the Faculty Senate re-authorize the Interdisciplinary Studies Committee to continue as an Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate for academic year 2002 – 2003.

Bob Rice moved, Dan Sandweiss seconded.

**VOTE:** 34 in favor, none opposed, 2 abstentions. Motion is approved.

#### **Policy for Vote: GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERDISCIPLINARY FACULTY GROUPS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE (Report of the ad hoc Interdisciplinary Studies Committee)**

##### **Preamble**

The Interdisciplinary Studies Committee of the Faculty Senate has worked with the Provost and the Graduate School Director in developing a set of guidelines for the establishment of interdisciplinary endeavors at the University of Maine. The committee's work has been guided by the charge given to the committee to encourage the development of interdisciplinary initiatives at the University of Maine, by the Strategic Plan's considerable emphasis devoted to the expansion of interdisciplinary endeavors, and by the fact that no

cross-College guidelines currently are in place to facilitate the establishment of such endeavors. The proposed Guidelines have been specifically crafted to allow a sufficient degree of flexibility in the conception and implementation of a broad array of interdisciplinary endeavors, yet also provide a framework within which the interests of all participants are safeguarded.

## **Motion**

Whereas an expansion of interdisciplinary endeavors in teaching, research, and service are acknowledged by the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost to be of increasing significance for the academic vitality of the University of Maine, and

Whereas the Strategic Plan of the University of Maine specifically calls in numerous places for the further development of interdisciplinary endeavors, and

Whereas the Faculty Senate considers its role in the encouragement and development of interdisciplinary endeavors to be fully consistent with the Senate's mission,

Be it moved that the document below, "General Guidelines for the Development of Interdisciplinary Faculty Groups at the University of Maine" be recommended for approval by the University of Maine administration.

### **General Guidelines for the Development of Interdisciplinary Faculty Groups at the University of Maine**

Interdisciplinary groups are self-governing faculty bodies in which membership is based on scholarly interest in a particular field or discipline, regardless of departmental affiliation. These guidelines are intended to apply to interdisciplinary groups that involve faculty and resources from more than one College.

An interdisciplinary group may be formed by an ad hoc committee of the faculty or by a steering committee appointed by the Executive Vice President and Provost. Faculty membership in interdisciplinary groups is voluntary unless a joint-appointment was part of the faculty member's initial appointment to the University of Maine. Workload reassignments, joint evaluation procedures, and compensation for the faculty member and/or home departments of faculty members joining interdisciplinary groups may be subject to renegotiation at the time the faculty member joins the interdisciplinary group. All changes must be approved by the home department, the Dean of the home College, and the Provost. If a joint appointment between a department and an interdisciplinary group is part of a faculty member's job description when they are hired, then such negotiations should take place at the time of appointment.

Group members shall adopt bylaws that are subject to review and approval by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and/or the Graduate School depending on the nature and purpose of the group. An Executive Committee selected from the group's membership shall oversee the administration of the program. The Executive Committee shall nominate members to serve on various standing committees for the group (e.g. Curriculum Committee, Membership Committee).

Interdisciplinary faculty groups may develop undergraduate programs, graduate programs, or both. With the exception of new concentrations offered under the existing Interdisciplinary Doctor of Philosophy program, a program proposed by a new interdisciplinary group is subject to the same review and approval process, both campus and system-wide, as a program proposed by a department. Existing group programs are also subject to the same review process as departmentally based programs to assure that program quality is maintained or improved. Groups may or may not formally sponsor courses, but do not receive support for the direct expenses of instruction. Instructional support for the group program shall be supplied by the department or departments providing the instructors. Departments receive workload credit for group course offerings just as for any other course.

### **Establishment of Interdisciplinary Graduate Faculty Groups**

In accordance with the appointment of Graduate Faculty at the University of Maine as outlined in the Constitution, the Graduate School may establish interdisciplinary groups of the Graduate Faculty. Each interdisciplinary group must develop its own bylaws describing the purpose of the group, the graduate degree program(s) to be offered by the faculty, and the governance processes to be implemented. The faculty bylaws shall be reviewed by the Graduate Board, and upon approval of the Board, the interdisciplinary graduate group will be recognized by the Graduate School.

Interdisciplinary graduate faculty groups may develop new graduate certificate programs, master's degree programs, or doctoral programs or may develop concentrations within the existing Interdisciplinary Doctor of Philosophy program. Such programs will be reviewed by the Graduate Board periodically to ensure that they are meeting their stated goals. With the recommendation of the Graduate Board, the Executive Vice President and Provost may terminate any concentration offered under the Interdisciplinary Doctor of Philosophy program.

Moved by Dan Sandweiss, seconded by Bob Rice.

## **Discussion**

[Owen Smith] In principle, great idea, but he is wondering what are the potential budgetary implications, potential implications to degree programs, etc.

[Jim Warhola] Some faculty envision that some interdisciplinary aspect would put faculty in stronger position to seek external funds, so they don't view it as zero-sum game. No guarantee that funding would be sought, but hard to imagine that.

[Dan Sandweiss] They did consider this. This is why provision for negotiating workload was added, so that these concerns could be considered.

[Warhola] Expressed appreciation for collegial manner in which they were able to work with Delcourt and Kennedy.

**VOTE:** 34 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstention. Motion approved.

**Motion for a vote: TO CONTINUE WINTER TERM IN 2003**

**Preamble**

The following letter was received from Robert Kennedy, addressed to Peter S. Hoff, with copies to the Provost's Council and Faculty Senate:

This is to request your approval of the unanimous decision made by the Provost's Council at its February meeting to discontinue the Winter/January Session.

Several deans pointed out that the between-semester session pulls enrollments out of spring and May Term courses and the enrollment in winter session has been going down. This would save on administrative time and expenses as well.

Elimination of the January inter-session would allow adjustments to be made in the spring semester academic calendar as well. Commencement could be held earlier and May Term could be completed entirely within the month of May since it would begin earlier. This, in turn, provides one of the most logical reasons to terminate Winter Session, namely, the "jump on the market" that it would provide to our graduates for summer employment.

If you support this recommendation, please inform the Faculty Senate.

I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Winter Term 2003 classes have already been announced to students and faculty in the Schedule of Classes for Fall 2002 and Spring 2003. Some students have been advised to take such classes, and may even be planning to take Winter Term classes as a means to completing course requirements for graduation in May 2003.

**Motion**

The Senate votes to continue Winter Term for January 2003.

Moved by Kim McKeage, seconded by Darlene Bay.

**Discussion**

[Paul Creasman] This was posed to Student Senate last night and received a unanimous vote to continue. Nearly half of the senators had taken advantage of this, and considered it important for meeting the "4-year guarantee".

[Dick Cook] Could we hear from Bob White about this?

[Bob White] Deferred to Kennedy.

[Provost Kennedy] This question came up last spring semester. Provost Council considered this, since there are budgetary considerations. These were as much as anything the driving force for the decision to try to get rid of it.

[Bob White] Winter Session was created as retention tool in 96-97. It started with 30 courses, 288 students. The high has been 45 courses, with 745 students, in 2001. As this increased, there was a decrease in May Term. In the past year dropped from 45 to 29, and enrollment dropped 14%, too. This represents about 1% of total activity [of CED?]. They looked at courses being mounted for FY '03 (Winter Term '03): 23 courses, and of these, 18 (78%) are going to be offered in fall, spring, and summer session. So given enrollment trends and percentage of the total contribution, they considered this as part of their part of the reallocation of the budget. The thinking was that the students who were counting on winter term would be able to shift to summer and other terms. He thinks it's prudent in terms of the reallocation of resources they were asked to make.

[Bob Rice] He understands that Winter Term schedule for next year has already been published?

[Bob White] What is published is a preliminary schedule – we all know that there is a great deal of changes made.

[Rice] But for planning purposes, they are listed at this point?

[White] [Indicated agreement] Data does not include Hutchinson Center.

[President Hoff] Asked for clarification from student representative: If the student government were presented with a choice of either maintaining winter session or going to a calendar that got students out earlier in Spring – any sense of which way they'd go?

[Creasman] He talked to some senators about that. Companies seem to wait about a month after graduation.

[Hoff] Just to be clear, he was thinking of summer employment.

[Creasman] Didn't address that.

[Kim McKeage] There was a lot of discussion last meeting that this came at exactly wrong time for advisors. Even though courses in winter are tentative, so are the ones for spring, and they have to think of that when registering, too. Currently we have students planning to graduate in winter '03 who'll be all messed up if this happens. Also, sounds like a one-year dip, and there may be several things that could have contributed to

this: 9/11, or first year with year-long catalog, and students had a lot of trouble finding the winter term courses. In the business school, students have to plan out a year at a time and submit at the time of advising.

[Kathleen March] Asked for clarification about Bob's statistics. About a 50% drop, but a 14% drop in number of students. So average number of students/class is better.

[White] He was not saying it's not working, necessarily, since it has been opportunity for students to expedite their graduation. They were looking at cuts that would least impact their operation, and there are courses that are offered at other times.

[Creasman] When students are being recruited, winter and May term are both touted as ways of shortening the time till graduation.

[Warhola] Called the question.

Need 2/3 majority to close off debate: for 32, 4 against.

**VOTE:** In favor: 26; opposed: 5; abstentions: 5. Motion passes.

**Motion for a Vote: RETAIN THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR 2002-2003, AS PUBLISHED IN THE GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE UNIVERSITY CATALOGS FOR 2001-2002.**

### **Preamble**

The Faculty Senate adopted the Seven Year Rotating Calendar (see below) in April, 1992. According to that calendar, the Spring semester began no earlier than Monday, January 11th, and no later than January 17th. In years in which January 15, 16, or 17 fall on a Monday, the 1992 calendar called for classes to begin on those dates. The introduction of Winter Term was accompanied by a one-week delay in the start of Spring semester. In those years in which the Spring semester was scheduled to begin on the third Monday of January, the introduction of Martin Luther King Jr. Day (the third Monday in January) as a university holiday, caused a further delay in the start of Spring semester to the Tuesday of the same week.

The University academic calendar for 2002-2003 has been published in the graduate and undergraduate catalogs for 2001-2002, which are widely available. That calendar shows that the Spring semester will begin on the Tuesday following the third Monday in January 2003 (i.e., January 21). Some members of the University community may already have made plans for January 2003 and for Spring Semester 2003 based on those catalogs. Maintaining the calendar as published would avoid confusion and the possibility of having to change plans already made.

### **Motion**

The Senate votes to begin the Spring Semester 2003 on the Tuesday following the third Monday in January 2003 (i.e., January 21).

ADDENDUM: Seven Year Rotating Calendar Approved by Faculty Senate 4/1992 Changes since then are in red and italic [sic]. April 19, 2002

When Labor Day is September 1:

Fall semester (2003, 2008, 2014) Classes begin Tuesday, September 2 Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 13-14 Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 26 Classes end Friday December 12 Final exams December 15-19 (5 days) Spring semester (2004, 2009, 2015) Classes begin Monday, January 12 No classes on Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, January 19 7 weeks of classes 2 week spring break 7 weeks of classes Maine Day penultimate Wednesday (approved through 2006) 1 week of final exams

When Labor Day is September 2:

Fall semester (2002, 2013) Classes begin Tuesday, September 3 Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 14-15 Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 27 Classes end Friday, December 13 Final exams December 16-20 (5 days) Spring semester (2014) Classes begin Monday, January 13 No classes on Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, January 20 (Same as spring semester above)

When Labor Day is September 3:

Fall semester (2007, 2012) Classes begin Tuesday, September 4 Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 8-9 Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 21 Classes end Friday, December 14 Final exams December 17-21 (5 days) Spring semester (2008, 2013) Classes begin Monday, January 14 No classes on Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, January 21 (Same as spring semester above) When Labor Day is September 4:

Fall semester (2006, 2012) Classes begin Tuesday, September 5 Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 9-10 Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 22 Classes end Friday, December 15 Final exams December 18-22 (5 days) Spring semester (2007, 2013) Classes begin Tuesday, January 16 Martin Luther King, Jr., Day (Same as spring semester above)

When Labor Day is September 5:

Fall semester (2005, 2011) Classes begin Tuesday, September 6 Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 10-11 Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 23 Classes end Friday December 16 Final exams December 19-22/23 (4/5 days) new exam format requires 5 days Spring semester (2006, 2012) Classes begin Tuesday, January 17 Martin Luther King, Jr., Day (Same as spring semester above)

When Labor Day is September 6:

Fall semester (2004, 2010) Classes begin Tuesday, September 7 or [Monday, August 30] Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 11-12 Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 24 Classes end Friday December 16 [10] Final exams December 20-23/24 (4/5 days) [13-17 5 days] new exam format requires 5 days Spring semester (2005, 2011) Classes begin Tuesday, January 18 Martin Luther King, Jr., Day (Same as spring semester above)

When Labor Day is September 7:

Fall semester (2009, 2015) Classes begin Monday, August 31 No Classes on Labor Day, Monday September 7 Fall break Monday and Tuesday, October 12-13 Thanksgiving Break Begins Wednesday, November 25 Classes end Friday December 11 Final exams December 14-18 (5 days) Spring semester (2010, 2016) Classes begin Monday, January 11 No classes on Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, January 18 (Same as spring semester above)

Moved by Bob Rice. Seconded by Tom Brann.

### Discussion

[Creasman] Was concerned about Labor Day information.

[John Maddaus] That is not part of motion.

[Keith Hutchison] Could have chaos if this doesn't pass, given the one we just passed.

[Rice Eason] If this passes, calendar will come up in October, so it will come up again.

[Dick Cook] If this passes – when will semester start?

[Maddaus] As published, Jan. 21.

[Kathleen March] Isn't this moot, since the only reason we brought this up was because the calendar and winter term are separate?

[Jim McClymer] Called the question.

**VOTE:** 32 in favor, none opposed, 3 abstentions. Motion approved.

## 2000 – 2001 Motions

### September 20, 2000 Motions

**Motion to Renew Senate Recommendation for Recovered Costs Distribution** was made H. Onsrud and seconded by K. Hermansen.

Last year, the Faculty Senate proposed a long-term plan for the redistribution of recovered costs, which the University of Maine Administration neither adopted nor responded to in detail. Instead, the Administration retained the earlier draught plan from which the Senate's Committee on Research and Public Service had begun its deliberations. The Administration's plan was viewed inadequate in addressing how the University of Maine distributes indirect cost charges generated through research grants back to sub-units of the University in a manner that provides sufficient incentives to the university community to increase flows of indirect research funds to the University. The core substance of our previous Faculty Senate motion was not addressed.

Therefore, the Senate asks the Committee on Research and Public Service to renew their study to develop a plan that will distribute indirect cost charges generated through research grants back to sub-units of the University in a manner that provides sufficient incentives to the university community to substantially increase flows of indirect research funds to the University. The Senate asks that the Committee on Research and Public Service report back by 13 December meeting.

**Discussion:** None

**Motion passed as stated.**

**Motion to Request Significant Participation in the Reassessment of Intellectual Property Rights Policies at the University of Maine System Level** made by H. Onsrud and seconded by K. Hermansen.

Last spring, the Faculty Senate became apprised of a document issued by the University of Maine System Office that spelled out an Intellectual Property Rights Policy that affects the faculty directly. The committee creating this document had little input from the Orono campus, which, as the flagship campus of the system, produces the most research and originates the greatest number of distance education courses via the combination of ITV and the World-Wide Web.

Therefore, the Faculty Senate asks the Committee on Research and Public Service to study the question of Intellectual Property Rights, to explore creation of a policy document for the University of Maine that might be used as an exemplar for the University of Maine System policy, and to request significant representation on the University of Maine System committee writing the system-wide policy. The Senate

asks that the Committee on Research and Public Service report back by 13 December meeting.

**Discussion:** None

**Motion passed as stated.**

**Motion to Assess and Explore Continuing the Class Book Project** made by P. Bauschatz and seconded by K. Hermansen.

The Class Book Project of the University of Maine is presently in its ninth year. It will conclude in its tenth year, academic 2001-02. Since the project was initiated by a resolution of the Faculty Senate, it is appropriate that the project be evaluated by the senate prior to its conclusion, if the project is to be continued beyond the tenth year. Since books are regularly chosen two years before their utilization, the decision to continue or discontinue the project must be made in academic 2000-01. Propaedeutic to this decision, a consideration of the value of the project should be completed in the fall semester of 2000. To this end, IT IS MOVED that the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate undertake an evaluation of the Class Book Project and make a recommendation to the full senate for termination or continuation before the end of Fall 2000.

**Discussion:** None

**Motion passed as stated.**

### **October 25, 2000 Motions**

#### **Definitions of Suspension and Dismissal**

The definitions of suspension and dismissal have been revised to bring them into conformity with the University of Maine System's definitions. P. Bauschatz moved that they are adopted, and the motion was seconded by E. Peterson.

##### **Academic Dismissal**

Dismissal action is normally the final action taken when students are not making satisfactory progress toward a degree or when students readmitted after suspension show no improvement in their grade point average or otherwise fail to meet conditions set by the college.

- a. The student is not normally allowed to apply for readmission.
- b. The action is posted to the official academic record.
- c. A hold is placed on the student record to preclude enrollment at all UMS institutions.

##### **Academic Suspension**

Academic suspension indicates that a student is separated from the University for a minimum of one semester. A student must file an application for readmission. Suspension is the usual action when a student fails to make normal progress toward graduation. Situations that lead to academic suspension are any one of the following:

- a. Students receive a semester grade-point average at or below 1.0;
- b. Students continued on academic probation fail to meet conditions as defined by the college dean, program director, or school director;
- c. First-year students (0-23 hrs) acquire an accumulative average less than 1.50 at the end of the first two semesters; Sophomores (24-53 hrs) acquire an accumulative average of 1.7 or less; Juniors (54-83 hrs) acquire an accumulative average of 1.8 or less; Seniors (84+ hrs) acquire an accumulative average of 1.9 or less.

Regulations under c. above also apply to transfer students. Exceptions may be made for students who have earned a semester average of at least 2.0 while on probation but have not achieved the required minimum accumulative average (Faculty Senate 3/31/93).

#### **Provisional Continuation**

First-semester students who are experiencing academic difficulties may be placed in a provisional continuation status. This intermediate status requires the student to discuss her or his academic record with the associate dean of the college, program director, or school director to determine whether the student will be placed on academic probation, suspension, or dismissal.

##### **Academic Activity during Suspension/Dismissal**

Students under dismissal or suspension may not be admitted as matriculated students at any university in the University of Maine System.

Students may request permission from their associate dean or program or school director to take one or two courses as a non-degree candidate at any UMS institution while they are under suspension.

**The motion was passed.**

### **November 29, 2000 Motions**

#### **Definitions of Suspension and Dismissal**

The definitions of suspension and dismissal have been revised to bring them into conformity with the University of Maine System's definitions. P. Bauschatz moved that they are adopted, and the motion was seconded by E. Peterson.

## Academic Dismissal

Dismissal action is normally the final action taken when students are not making satisfactory progress toward a degree or when students readmitted after suspension show no improvement in their grade point average or otherwise fail to meet conditions set by the college.

- a. The student is not normally allowed to apply for readmission.
- b. The action is posted to the official academic record.
- c. A hold is placed on the student record to preclude enrollment at all UMS institutions.

## Academic Suspension

Academic suspension indicates that a student is separated from the University for a minimum of one semester. A student must file an application for readmission. Suspension is the usual action when a student fails to make normal progress toward graduation. Situations that lead to academic suspension are any one of the following:

- a. Students receive a semester grade-point average at or below 1.0;
- b. Students continued on academic probation fail to meet conditions as defined by the college dean, program director, or school director;
- c. First-year students (0-23 hrs) acquire an accumulative average less than 1.50 at the end of the first two semesters; Sophomores (24-53 hrs) acquire an accumulative average of 1.7 or less; Juniors (54-83 hrs) acquire an accumulative average of 1.8 or less; Seniors (84+ hrs) acquire an accumulative average of 1.9 or less.

Regulations under c. above also apply to transfer students. Exceptions may be made for students who have earned a semester average of at least 2.0 while on probation but have not achieved the required minimum accumulative average (Faculty Senate 3/31/93).

## Provisional Continuation

First-semester students who are experiencing academic difficulties may be placed in a provisional continuation status. This intermediate status requires the student to discuss her or his academic record with the associate dean of the college, program director, or school director to determine whether the student will be placed on academic probation, suspension, or dismissal.

## Academic Activity during Suspension/Dismissal

Students under dismissal or suspension may not be admitted as matriculated students at any university in the University of Maine System.

Students may request permission from their associate dean or program or school director to take one or two courses as a non-degree candidate at any UMS institution while they are under suspension.

## The motion was passed.

### December 13, 2000 Motions

No Motions voted on

### January xx, 2001 Motions

**UMPSA Contract Negotiations Support:** J. Maddaus made the motion as written, pointing out that there were three fact finders appointed through the Maine Labor Relations Board. Seconded by J. Horan.

## Preamble

Professional staff of the university perform very important functions at the University of Maine, but are not being adequately and equitably recognized for their contributions in contract negotiations. The University of Maine Professional Staff Association (UMPSA) represents 1158 employees system-wide, and over 500 on this campus, as of December 2000. Negotiations between UMS and UMPSA have dragged since April 7, 1999, over what was to have been a two-year contract, and still the contract issues have not been resolved. Fact finders have made recommendations which UMPSA has agreed to accept, but which UMS has refused. UMS persists in offering UMPSA less than what has been negotiated for other units and for state employees, despite a special legislative appropriation of \$4 million to settle outstanding contracts (see comparisons below). The ability of the university to attract and retain highly qualified people for professional positions may be compromised by the failure of UMS to agree to an equitable contract.

Salary increase:

UMS offer to UMPSA: 7.5%

UMPSA position prior to fact finding: 9.0%

Fact finder recommendation: 8.5%

AFUM settlement: 8.0%

ACSUM settlement: 7.875%

Service & Maintenance settlement: 7.5%-10.5% depending on steps

Non-represented: 7.5%

State employee settlement: 9.0%

Technical college settlement: 9.0%

Health insurance premiums:

Single	Single+1	Family
--------	----------	--------

UMS offer:	379.92	581.64	790.56
------------	--------	--------	--------

UMPSA position:	332.64	433.00	593.00
-----------------	--------	--------	--------

Fact finder recommendation:	332.64	510.00	750.00
-----------------------------	--------	--------	--------

AFUM settlement:	332.64	499.20	739.20
------------------	--------	--------	--------

ACSUM settlement:	332.00	364.82	445.32
-------------------	--------	--------	--------

Service & Maintenance settlement:	332.00	364.82	445.32
-----------------------------------	--------	--------	--------

Note: UMPSA believes the fact finders' recommendations of health insurance premiums were based on inaccurate information provided by UMS and that is why they are being asked to pay as much as they are--more than any other unit.

Salary Equity:

UMS offer: Nothing

UMPSA position: Find and fix equity problems

Fact finder recommendation: Fix equity problems by 12/31/02

Salary system:

UMS offer: Do a study

UMPSA position: Implement a system

Fact finder recommendation: Study other systems with UMPSA

input, report by 12/31/01, negotiate, implement

## Motion

The Faculty Senate endorses an immediate, fair and equitable settlement of the UMPSA contract in accordance with the fact finders' recommendations, and asks the President of the University of Maine to represent the University in support of such a settlement.

**Discussion:** This was headed toward arbitration – is it there yet? No.

**The motion was passed.**

**End of Semester Grade Due Date:** K. Hutchinson put forward this motion. In terms of rules that are in place (i.e. 1983 faculty handbook), it states that grades are due one week from the final exam. It doesn't address term papers or art projects or the consequences if you don't get them in on time. The Faculty Senate has never addressed or changed these rules. This is a timely moment for this discussion, given the current revision process for the faculty handbook. K. Hutchinson contacted Alison Cox and Doug Gelinas, who agreed that we could go back to the one-week timetable from before, now that we have the additional week in December. Seconded by J. McClymer

## Preamble

The Faculty of the University of Maine strives to provide its students with the highest quality education possible. There are many elements that go into the educational process that effect its quality, such as attention to detail in class preparation, attention to changes in the discipline, attention to student reactions and questions, attention to students. There are, similarly, many ways by which progress in learning can be measured, such as examinations, discussions, reading assignments, term papers, laboratory reports, creative works. To give the students of The University of Maine a quality education requires time. To give them a fair measure of their progress and success also requires time. It requires not only the time put into a well thought out examination/evaluation procedure but also the time to fairly assess the results of that procedure. To do less would be to do disservice to our students particularly those students who similarly strive to obtain the most of their educational experience.

In recent years, under a directive of questionable authority, faculty has received a memorandum from the administration at the end of semester stating that final grades are due three working days after the final exam for their class or classes. This time interval was apparently set to accommodate the need to inform, in a timely fashion, those students who are to be dismissed from the University. It does not, however, allow for the fair and thorough examination and grading process deserved by all students. This is particularly true for the upper level or advanced courses, the ones most likely to involve more complex exam questions (problem solving and essay questions), creative works, or term papers or writing assignments.

The Faculty Handbook of 1983 states in Section 6.6 Final Grade Reports: *"final grade reports are required to be in the Registrar's Office within one week from the time the final examination is administered."* The Handbook is clearly in need of revision, a process now underway. However, until the Handbook is revised the 1983 version remains the existing rulebook for faculty. There is no evidence of the Faculty senate ever taking action to



change the above rule, either on its own or at the request of the administration. It is, then, this rule that is in place and established the time for final grade reports.

It should be noted that even the existing rule, though providing the time for a more complete and fairer examination process, does not address the issue of due date for final grades for those courses in which students are submitting other works, such as term papers, art projects or laboratory reports during or at the end of the final exam week.

### **Motion**

Therefore, in recognition of the desire of faculty to provide students with a process that fairly and completely evaluates their educational experience, and in recognition of the conflicting information faculty have been receiving regarding the due date for final grades, it is moved:

1. That the Faculty Senate, by their vote for this motion, reaffirm both the due date for reporting final grades and their control over the decision process that changes that schedule; and
2. That the Handbook Committee, as part of the handbook amendment process, be directed by the Faculty Senate to re-examine the issue of due date for final grade reports, including providing a schedule for final grade reports for those courses in which students submit final reports, projects, term papers, etc. during the final exam week, either in addition to a final exam or instead of a final exam.

### **Discussion**

K. March: The current draft of the revised handbook does not agree with this one week due date. She read the current draft and cautioned us to keep in mind that this is only a draft and the committee would welcome faculty input on this and will extend its purview to create/suggest new deadline, address gaps in existing policy rather than simply edit existing. D. Gelinas: The whole process of review of documents before sending suspension/dismissal and the right of appeal is lengthy and a lot has to go on before classes begin. Please keep it in mind when deciding how much time to allow for grade due dates. R. Cook feels it's good to remind people of these requirements, but he doesn't feel the administration should be responsible if students who are candidates for dismissal or suspension decide to begin the spring semester.

It was a VP for Academic Affairs who set the current deadlines because of the process required. Student records agreed to the terms of this motion. K. March says the Faculty Senate constitution states that the Faculty Senate will consider administration needs when setting policy in this regard.

**The motion was passed unanimously.**

**Ad-Hoc Committee for Fostering Interdisciplinary Studies:** O. Smith put forth a motion to form a committee to review interdisciplinary studies.

Motion to form a committee to review interdisciplinary studies initiatives

### **Preamble**

Whereas interdisciplinary initiatives are an increasingly important aspect of developments in post-secondary education in the 21st century.

Whereas there are many significant discussions of the nature and form of interdisciplinary studies taking place at a state and national level.

Whereas there are several nascent as well as some established interdisciplinary initiatives at the University of Maine .

Whereas there has been no general consideration of such initiatives and their role and place in the pedagogical and structural frames of the University of Maine .

Be it moved that the Faculty senate establish an ad hoc committee to review current interdisciplinary studies programs and explore how we might encourage future interdisciplinary initiatives at the University of Maine .

**The motion was passed.**

### **February 28, 2001 Motions**

**Motion in Support of Adoption of the document titled "University of Maine System Statement of Policy Governing Patents and Copyrights"** H. Onsrud read aloud the proposed motion (below), pointing out that D. Humphrey worked with a committee of the administration in drafting the document, and that the motion comes from the Senate Research & Public Policy Committee.

### **Background**

A committee of the administration of the University of Maine recently completed a draft of a document titled "University of Maine System Statement of Policy Governing Patents and Copyrights" (Version dated 2/27/01 ). The document was circulated to all elected members of the University of Maine Faculty Senate and was reviewed explicitly by the Research and Public Service Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Whereas the document appropriately and equitably balances the interests of the public, administration, students, faculty of the University of Maine ,

Whereas the document positions the University, faculty and students for advancing and taking advantage of new media and course delivery opportunities, and

Whereas the policy provides the necessary incentives and protections to encourage the discovery and development of new knowledge and its application for the public benefit,

Be it resolved that,

### **Motion**

The University of Maine Faculty Senate strongly supports the adoption of the policy document in its entirety for the University of Maine subject to a limited period of further comment and review by faculty, students, and the administration or, if appropriate, supports adoption by the entire University of Maine System .

### **March 28, 2001 Motions**

**Domestic Partner Employment Facilitation:** J. Kuhns-Hastings brought forward this motion from the University Environment Committee

**Preamble:** The Faculty Senate recognizes the importance of facilitating dual-career campus community couples. Increasingly, such facilitation is necessary in order for departments and schools to be successful in their recruitment and retention efforts. We, the Faculty Senate, note that dual career couples will enrich the campus milieu. While we recognize the Opportunity Hire Program, we also recognize that it is not adequately publicized for the university community.

Because dual-career partnerships typically involve employment needs and/or opportunities across units, university-level policy is required.

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate requests that the President of the University of Maine appoint a committee whose membership is comprised of at least half faculty members, to develop and make public a policy relating to the facilitation of employment of dual-career couples in matters of faculty retention and recruitment, and that University resources related to that policy be made equally available to all units on campus.

### **Proposed Amendment to the Constitution**

Section 9. Evaluation of UMaine administrators. The Faculty Senate, acting through the Executive Committee chaired by the President of the Faculty Senate, shall conduct faculty evaluations of UMaine administrators, in consultation with the President of the University.

J. Maddaus made the above motion, pointing out that it requires a 2/3 vote of approval from the Faculty Senate and must then be submitted to the faculty at large, which also requires a 2/3 vote for approval in order for it to be adopted.

**The amendment was approved**, with 47 votes in favor, zero against, and two abstentions.

### **Definitions of Faculty, Units, Programs of Study**

P. Bauschatz went over wording changes from the draft motion discussed at the elected members meeting. The motion now reads as follows.

**Motion:** In order to clarify policies for hiring and evaluating faculty, it is MOVED that the University of Maine adopt the following definitions and procedures:

- 1.) All courses taught at the University of Maine are taught by faculty (or by Teaching Assistants enrolled in advanced degree programs and directly supervised by faculty.)
- 2.) All faculty teaching courses, full time or part-time, are appointed according to criteria established in the department, division, or appropriate unit in which the faculty member teaches and in which the courses are taught.
- 3.) An appropriate unit at the University of Maine is a department, division, school, institute, or college, maintaining for the purpose of evaluation, reappointment, and promotion, regular approved procedures for forming peer committees. The unit offers an approved program of study leading to an academic degree or, in the case of support programs or institutes, a program of study leading to matriculation in a degree-granting program.
- 4.) A peer, as here defined, has full-time faculty status (a unit member according to the AFUM contract) and is tenured or is on a tenure track.
- 5.) Requests to hire faculty are initiated by the appropriate department, division, or other appropriate unit (as described above) and are approved through regular academic channels, culminating with approval from the Provost. Members of search committees named by the department, division, or other appropriate unit are faculty members as defined in items 2-4, above. Additional members of search committees may be non-faculty members, if such members are approved by the peer committee of the unit.
- 6.) In some cases, faculty teach courses in more than one program of study and are appointed in more than one department, division, or appropriate unit. Such appointments are approved by all of the interested units and the subsequent academic channels, culminating with approval from the Provost. Such faculty are evaluated by a peer committee whose makeup is determined by the standing peer committees of the interested academic units.
- 7.) Some faculty have adjunct or cooperating status: that is, they hold non-academic appointments inside or outside the university but have expertise making them qualified to teach. Such faculty are also appointed and evaluated according to the procedures outlined above.
- 8.) When time constrains the implementation of the hiring procedures outlined in 5.), above, emergency appointments may be made administratively (according to Article 7.3 of the AFUM contract). Such appointments do not normally extend beyond one academic year. Faculty so appointed are evaluated by procedures adopted by the relevant unit's peer committee.

9.) Appointment of faculty with joint research/teaching status are approved by both the Vice President for Research and the Provost. Such faculty are subject to the procedures outlined in 2.) 5.), above, and they are evaluated by procedures adopted by the relevant unit's peer committee.

#### **April 25, 2001 Motions**

##### **Faculty Appointments: Proposed policy**

###### **Original motion:**

Proposed policy for a vote: FACULTY APPOINTMENTS – Submitted by Peter Hoff and Robert Kennedy (distributed at the full Senate meeting on 2/27/02, and previously discussed by Elected Members Committee on 3/6/02 and 4/10/02)

Effective immediately, all regular, tenure-track faculty appointments must be made in an existing academic department. In the case of the College of Education and Human Development where there are no departments, appointments are made in the College. Further, the standard procedures for formulating a peer committee, as addressed in departmental promotion and tenure criteria and, if appropriate, criteria for joint appointment, need to be followed for all faculty appointments.

The Executive Vice President/Provost will begin discussions immediately with the appropriate deans to secure regular departmental affiliations for all tenure-track faculty currently holding interdisciplinary appointments.

This was moved by Howard Patterson and seconded by Christa Schwintzer.

###### **Amendment:**

An amendment was offered by Bill Farthing to add “new” between “all” and “regular”, and to add a line saying that the department must approve appointment by a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. This was seconded by Bryan Pearce.

###### **Discussion of amendment:**

[Farthing:] Have already discussed the problem existing in the psych dept. Could avoid this in future by voting when admin might decide to hire someone, then place them in a dept.

**Vote on amendment:** 23 in favor, 8 opposed, 4 abstained. Amendment passed.

###### **Amendment:**

Irving Kornfeld offered another amendment: substitute “department or school” for “department”. Second by Andy Thomas.

###### **Discussion of amendment:**

[Dianne Hoff:] Asked about whether voting in departmentless college would be for whole college. John answered that the College of Education and Human Development operates like a department.

[Owen Smith:] Point of discussion: Given amendment language of first paragraph, the second paragraph is inappropriate.

[John Maddaus:] They are two separate issues.

**Vote on amendment:** 33 in favor, no opposed, 5 abstained. Amendment passed.

The Parliamentarian advised that we need to amend again for the second paragraph.

Bill Farthing so moved, Mike Howard seconded.

**Vote:** 27 in favor, 7 opposed, 5 abstained. Amendment passed.

###### **Amended motion:**

Effective immediately, all new, regular, tenure-track faculty appointments must be made in an existing academic department or school. In the case of the College of Education and Human Development where there are no departments, appointments are made in the College. Further, the standard procedures for formulating a peer committee, as addressed in departmental promotion and tenure criteria and, if appropriate, criteria for joint appointment, need to be followed for all faculty appointments. The department or school must approve the appointment by a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

The Executive Vice President/Provost will begin discussions immediately with the appropriate deans to secure regular departmental affiliations for all tenure-track faculty currently holding interdisciplinary appointments. The department or school must approve the appointment by a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

**VOTE ON MOTION** 33 in favor, none opposed, 5 abstained. Motion passed.

##### **Peer Committees for Joint Appointments: Proposed Policy**

Proposed Policy for a vote: PEER COMMITTEES FOR JOINT APPOINTMENTS – Submitted by Peter Hoff and Robert Kennedy (distributed at the full Senate meeting on 2/27/02, and previously discussed by Elected Members Committee on 3/6/02 and 4/10/02; new sentence added in bold in the handout)

All tenure-track faculty with joint appointments must have a home with an academic department. For tenure and promotion of research faculty, joint peer committees consisting of peers from the research unit and the home academic department need to be appointed by the academic

department chair in consultation with the center director. No less than 50% of the joint committee shall be from the academic department. The peer committee makes its report to the department chair and the director of the research unit. The director forwards his/her recommendation to the Vice President for research. The department chair forwards his/her recommendation to the dean. In turn, the Dean and the Vice President for Research send their recommendations to the Executive Price President/Provost. After review and discussion by the Administrative Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, the EVP/Provost forwards his/her recommendation to the President for action. Motion was made by Bill Farthing; Kathleen March seconded.

**Amendment:**

[Farthing:] In view of the changes in previous policy, first sentence should be eliminated. He proposed this as an amendment. Ed Ferguson seconded.

**Discussion of amendment:**

[Dana Humphrey:] If we eliminate the first sentence, it would start off with "For tenure and promotion of research faculty", which would make the policy apply to all research faculty, and that was not the intent.

[Provost Kennedy:] There are a couple of operative words in first sentence – if we lose words "joint appointments", that loses what it applies to.

[Farthing:] Proposed that we change the title, and modify the second line to read "tenure track research faculty".

[Parliamentarian:] This has to be a separate motion.

[Farthing:] Can the amendment be withdrawn?

[Parliamentarian:] No, it has already been seconded.

**Vote on amendment:** 2 in favor, 29 opposed, 7 abstained. Amendment fails.

Kim McKeage pointed out (in the form of an amendment) that the third line should read "Vice President" rather than "Price President". This does not require an amendment, and John Maddaus assured the Senate that the typo will be corrected.

[Ed Ferguson:] We still need to address Dana's point about research faculty – the first line stands alone, so we still need an amendment to only apply to tenure-track faculty.

**Amendment:**

[Mike Howard:] Can we include a change to the title as an amendment? [Parliamentarian agreed.] Howard so moved. There was a second by Don Hayes.

**Discussion of amendment:**

[Bill Farthing:] Is this supposed to apply to everyone with joint appointments?

[Bob Rice:] When this was drafted, it was the operational practice for research faculty, and Dan Dwyer drafted it. It went through many drafts, but the word "research" remained. He thinks it applies to all joint appointments.

[Keith Hutchison:] So if someone has a 25% appointment in one dept, 75% in another, they'd have 50-50 representation in each department?

[Provost Kennedy:] It could be.

[John Maddaus:] There are references to "research" in the document, so there would have to be some changes throughout.

It was pointed out that it could be tabled.

**Motion to table:**

Bob Rice so moved, Kim McKeage seconded.

**Vote on tabling:** 32 in favor, no opposed, one abstained. Motion is tabled.

**Motion: Solid Waste Minimization Committee**

Motion for a vote, TO CREATE A SOLID WASTE MINIMIZATION COMMITTEE, submitted by the Finance and Institutional Planning Committee

**Preamble**

During recent years earlier advances in waste minimization were lost. Currently the University is recycling only 39% of mixed office paper and magazines (includes newspaper), 54% of cardboard, and 2% of organic cafeteria waste. Since July 1, 2001 the University has had a Sustainability Officer whose responsibilities include waste minimization. However, this one individual cannot do all the work required. At an earlier time the University had an ad hoc committee on Waste Management. In May 1999, the President Symanski sent a letter to President Hoff recommending that the Waste Committee be made permanent although the Senate had not passed a formal motion to that effect. In a letter dated 30 January 2000, President Hoff replied "Solid Waste Committee. Although there was not a formal motion on this, we concur with the sense of the Senate that the Solid Waste Committee should stand as an official committee." At present this committee does not exist.

**Motion**

A Committee of the Administration known as the Solid Waste Minimization Committee should be established as soon as possible, but no later than September 2002, to work with the Sustainability Officer in finding ways to minimize production of solid waste and to maximize recycling of solid waste in a cost effective manner. Such solid waste includes but is not limited to paper, glass, metals, organic cafeteria waste, and other solid waste identified by the Sustainability Officer. The committee membership should include faculty and staff with expertise in relevant areas such as composting. The committee should have six members, one of whom is a member of the Faculty Senate. It should be appointed by the President in consultation with the Sustainability Officer and the President of the Faculty Senate.

Motion was introduced by Christa Schwintzer. Scott Wilkerson, the Campus Sustainability Officer, was introduced. Christa noted that there was such a committee on an ad hoc basis at one point, and Wilkerson would like the advice of a more permanent committee. The intent is that solid waste is only one responsibility of the Sustainability Officer, but it makes sense for this area to have a committee, even though President Hoff is suggesting broader committee in addition.

Motion was seconded by Roger King.

### **Discussion**

[Gregory White:] He questioned restricting this to solid waste management and asked if it is feasible for this committee to look at energy, etc., as well? He does not see a compelling reason to limit the scope.

[Schwintzer:] The logic is that the President is planning to appoint a larger committee (announced yesterday). The idea of this is that this committee would advise on this particular subset of problems.

[White:] Given that this was announced yesterday, is this the best idea?

[Schwintzer:] The Committee did discuss this, and decided to proceed.

[Wilkerson:] He said he could absolutely use the assistance and guidance. He does not know what the makeup of the new committee [that the President announced] will be like. He envisions it will look at energy, green building issues, etc. He sees smaller groups feeding information to the larger group. He does not see them as being competing or overlapping, but more as feeding each other.

**Vote:** 26 in favor, one opposed, two abstained. Motion passes.

### **May 9, 2001 Motions**

#### **Motion to Thank Michael Grillo for His Outstanding Leadership of Faculty Senate in the 2000-2001 Academic Year**

Whereas: Michael Grillo has led the Senate through a lengthy process of consideration of the university's five-year strategic plan; and

Whereas: Michael Grillo has led the Senate and especially the Executive Committee through the first ever campus-wide faculty evaluations of UMaine administrators, following procedures newly adopted in April 2000, and dealing with significant concerns in several cases; and

Whereas: Michael Grillo has established and pursued an agenda of addressing complex and unresolved issues related to the definitions of faculty and related issues; and

Whereas: Michael Grillo has established direct communication between the Senate and the University's Board of Visitors; and

Whereas: Michael Grillo has encouraged and supported a variety of other actions to come to and be addressed by the Senate, such as: clarifying faculty intellectual property rights, updating of the Faculty Handbook, strengthening first year experience courses, reconsidering general education requirements, extending the class book project, clarifying the minimum class enrollment policy, finding an alternative location for display of Hudson Museum artifacts, monitoring university finances, supporting a fair and equitable resolution of the UMPSA contract deadlock, and creating committees to examine interdisciplinary programs and university policy with respect to employment of domestic partners; and

Whereas: Michael Grillo has demonstrated clear direction, persistence, good humor and positive working relationships with colleagues and administrators throughout the process of addressing these important issues;

Therefore, through this motion,

The Faculty Senate thanks Michael Grillo for his outstanding leadership of Senate meetings and Executive Committee meetings, as well as on countless other occasions during the 2000-2001 academic year. Michael Grillo has carried on the traditions of his predecessors in an exemplary manner, and has truly left the Senate and the university a better place through his efforts.

#### **Motion to continue the study and development of the General Education requirements at the University of Maine .**

Whereas the current discussions regarding General Education have raised many points that need further study and consider and,

Whereas the University of Maine must consider and develop effective general education requirements with stated learning objectives and,

Whereas the University of Maine must develop General Education outcomes and a means of assessing them prior to its next accreditation,

Be it resolved that the General Education Special Committee be authorized to continue the work started this year in the next academic year.

## 1999 – 2000 Motions

### September 22, 1999 Motions

#### Motion to Charge Academic Affairs Committee Academic Standards (Jane Smith)

##### Preamble

Education is not a spectator sport. No one can sit in a classroom watching the faculty at work and expect to go away with anything more than an impression of learning unless the student is engaged in the learning process. Courses at the University of Maine address a wide variety of topics and employ many different instructional techniques, but often have a few fundamental characteristics in common to engage students. The common techniques employed in most University of Maine courses include – attendance, writing, library use, reading, and homework.

The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education is considering the placement of an open letter to students. The letter will emphasize certain academic standards and expectations at the University of Maine. The letter would help prevent the disengagement of students from their studies and help build a better intellectual climate at the University. For example, students could be provided minimum engagement expectations in an open letter similar to the following.

**Attendance.** Attending classes is not optional; it is expected. No educational benefit can be derived from non-participation. Students with unexcused absences may fail or receive a reduced course grade.

**Writing.** Expect at least one substantial writing assignment in every course. Clear, concise, forceful writing is one of the most powerful attributes of an educated person. Like most other skills, good writing is perfected through practice, criticism, and more practice.

**Library.** Plan to spend several hours each week completing library assignments. No textbook or other single source contains all you need to know about anything. But a library such as the Fogler, with millions of documents and books and extensive electronic resources, can meet most information needs. Learning to search out information is an essential skill for everyone who wants knowledge that is more than superficial.

**Reading.** Be prepared to spend a lot of time reading. Reading remains the means by which we learn most of what we know. You will be expected to read textbooks, other books, manuals, articles, and a variety of other print materials.

**Homework.** Most courses will include assigned homework. The real work of learning takes place mainly outside the classroom, during the hours you spend completing study assignments. The world of work for which you are preparing gives few rewards just for showing up. The meetings, conferences, interviews, and briefings that form the work of the educated professional are backed up by hours of preparation. The reading, research, and writing that you will do to be a success in your professional life have their origins in the writing, research, and other homework that you will do at Maine. The habits of the successful graduate start with the first day of your freshman year.

##### Motion

Therefore, the motion is made to charge the Academic Affairs Committee to examine and publish minimum expectations for engaging the undergraduate student in those cases where specific expectations are not otherwise set forth by the faculty to the students. In particular the Committee shall examine, report, and make recommendations regarding minimum expectations in:

Attendance

Writing

Library Use

Reading

Homework

Field/Practice Experience

Cooperative Learning

Other areas of similar or pertinent application

The committee shall examine and report back to the senate with recommendations:

Stating if published expectations are/are not necessary

If published expectations are necessary, what areas should have published expectations;

What levels of performance should be expected from students, as a minimum, for each area; and

What consequences should be expected by students where minimum expectations are not met.

Other recommendations reasonably related to this topic.

The committee shall report back to the full senate with recommendation(s) at the November meeting.

##### Discussion

Doug Gelinas explained that the administration is proposing the letter in response to disappointing results from the recent survey that indicated students spend very little time studying. There is a perceived need to make expectations explicit. Members expressed concern that the letter should be appropriate for students across campus, and a corresponding concern that explicit mention of some expected activities may lead students to value those to the exclusion of other, equally important activities. It was suggested that a make-up policy could be included.

#### The motion passed with a clear majority

#### Motion to Charge Committee on Finance and Institutional Planning Identify Needs and Recommend Funding to the Hudson Museum (Bob Rice)

##### Preamble

The Senate Constitution under article III, Section 2 states: "The Senate shall have the authority to review and make recommendations regarding ... institutional plans and priorities, the allocation of the University's financial resources...." Under the By-Laws, Article IV, section 4, the Committee on Finance and Institutional Planning can deal with "budgetary issues affecting university priorities and allocation."

The Hudson Museum within the Maine Center for the Arts (MCA) is now a landmark of this University, attracting large crowds to view the historical exhibits and attend cultural affairs that high-light the arts and science at the University of Maine. It provides an attractive and spacious area for inter-college events such as high school recruiting, college fairs, and student/faculty social events. Classes in Anthropology, Art History and History use the Hudson Museum's collection. The University of Maine is honor-bound to protect and preserve these historical collections. However, the care and maintenance of the area is expensive. Historical exhibits require special care and extra expenses. Donors expect that their donations be maintained. It behooves the senate to investigate special needs of the Hudson Museum and make recommendations for purchases and funding of the Hudson Museum.

### **Motion**

Therefore, the motion is made to charge the Committee on Finance and Institutional Planning to make recommendation(s) to identify special needs and seek or entice funding to provide for the care, maintenance, and preservation of the Hudson Museum, Maine Center for the Arts. In particular the Committee shall examine, report, and make recommendations regarding:

Special needs of the Hudson Museum

Costly maintenance needs of the Hudson Museum

Need and priority of funding for the Hudson Museum

Methods and procedures for funding, including alumni requests.

The committee shall have such power as necessary to investigate and make recommendations regarding the Hudson Museum and its financial needs.

The committee shall report back to the full senate with recommendation(s) at the November meeting.

### **Discussion**

Steve Whittington, the Director of the Museum spoke. The museum attracts national and even international attention and visitors. Currently, the roof leaks, the air-conditioning malfunctions creating flaking plaster, and mold, and the carpet is infested with carpet beetles. Some of the artifacts have been removed and the museum has been forced to decline the opportunity for some traveling exhibits. Asked why this state of affairs has occurred, he stated that he has been pushing for funding for more than a year, with little response. One problem is the high price tag for the necessary repairs. Cynthia Mahmood stated that the loss of even one artifact from the museum would reflect shamefully on the entire campus.

**The motion passed by general consent.**

### **Motion to Charge Constitution and Bylaws Committee Monitor and Encourage Attendance at Senate Meetings (Michael Grillo)**

#### **Preamble**

The Senate is a body authorized to carry out actions and take on certain responsibilities necessary for the orderly and reasonable function of the academic environment at the University of Maine. Senators are apportioned to various colleges, student groups, and administrators. Responsive, timely, and comprehensive actions require the participation of all representatives.

It has been apparent in the past that duly elected or appointed members of the senate have failed to attend and failed to appoint substitutes in their place as allowed by the Constitution, Section 6. Accordingly, those senators who attend senate meetings and its committees have been deprived of the wisdom of those absent, colleges and other groups have not been fully represented, and those attending have had to shoulder a larger burden of the responsibilities of the senate and its committees. To provide for equitable senate work loads, prevent abusive reporting (e.g., absentee faculty claiming senate service on promotion requests), and insure adequate college representation on the senate and its committees, the constitution and/or by-laws should be amended to provide for sanctions and/or removal of senators who fail to meet reasonable expectations of senate membership.

#### **Motion**

Therefore, the motion is made to charge the Constitution and By-Laws Committee to:

1. report on means, methods, or procedures to:

monitor absences of senate members or their substitute;

determine what constitutes excessive absences; and

determine what constitutes unexcused absences.

2. make a recommendation(s) with wording necessary to amend the Constitution or By-laws to encourage or compel attendance by senators or their substitute.

The committee shall report back to the full senate with recommendation(s) at the December meeting.

#### **Discussion**

Vollmers stated that last year, there were at least 25 absences each meeting

**The motion passed by general consent.**

**Motion to Charge Library Committee Funding from Windfalls (Michael Grillo)**

NOTE: the committee charged in this motion was changed to the Finance and Institutional Planning Committee

**Preamble**

A library is a knowledge repository for a University. It provides services and resources for students in all colleges. The library provides an environment conducive to learning and studying. The maintenance and upkeep of a library is expensive. Consequently, the library should be a lead candidate in obtaining funds from windfalls such as the money Coca-Cola® has paid and will pay in the future to the University for the transfer of the sole marketing rights to soft beverage vending on the campus.

**Motion**

The motion is made for the Library Committee to investigate how to effectively petition, steer, or otherwise negotiate with the Administration to garner money for the Library from income windfalls.

The committee shall report back to the full senate with recommendation(s) by the December meeting.

**Discussion**

Several members expressed concern that this recommendation not obscure the pressing need for long-term on-going funding for the library. Alan Rosenwasser asked if there were any constraints on how the Coca-Cola funds were to be used. There are not. Bob Rice proposed a friendly amendment to change the wording to investigating a procedure for faculty input into the use of windfall funds. Michael Grillo (as the author) did not find the amendment friendly. He stated the wording does not preclude pursuit of other sources of funding for the library.

**The motion passed with 21 in favor and 14 opposed.**

**Motion to Charge Committee on the University Environment Review of Administrative Reports on the Activity Hour (Bob Rice)**

**Preamble**

By majority vote, the senate during its previous term restricted the MWF 2-3 p.m. activity hour (initiated by the administration) to the Fall Semester pending further review. The senate requested the administration monitor, evaluate, and report to the senate regarding the value and use of the activity period during the Fall Semester. In order to provide timely response to the expected administration's fact-finding, the Committee on the University Environment of the faculty senate will accept, study, and make recommendations based on the information.

**Motion**

The motion is made for the Committee on the University Environment be charged as follows:

The committee is charged with receiving, examining, reading, reviewing, and analyzing administration information on the feasibility and value of a fixed activity period.

The objectives of the committee will be to present one or more recommendations in the form of motion(s) for discussion and formal vote before the faculty senate.

The recommendations will be to keep, modify, or eliminate the existing activity periods, its length, or the days and periods it occurs on.

The Committee on the University Environment shall report back to the faculty senate with its recommendation(s) at the December Senate meeting. The committee shall have the authority of the senate to request, demand, evaluate, monitor, and further study the feasibility of the activity period.

**Discussion**

Members were concerned that information could not be gathered quickly enough to assess the effect of the change by December. However, a decision must be made in order to schedule classes for next fall. Michael Grillo stated that while benefits can be assessed, there is no way to assess the damage done by the Maine Hour. President Hoff stated that he believes the information can be given to the committee by November in time for the committee report in December.

**The motion was passed by a clear majority.**

**Motion to Charge The Academic Affairs Committee Review of Academic Appeal Procedure (Judy Kuhns-Hastings)**

**Preamble**

Students have the right to appeal academic decisions by faculty and the appeal may reverse or modify a faculty member's decision. Equity and fairness to the faculty ought to require the faculty member be given timely feedback on the appeal process. Under the present procedure for academic appeals, there is no component for feedback to the faculty member or allowance for faculty rebuttal. The academic appeal procedure should require that each party be informed of decisions and allowable time periods for each level of a decision.

**Motion**

Therefore, the motion is made to charge the Academic Affairs Committee of faculty senate as follows:



The committee will be charged with reviewing and making recommendations for modification of the academic appeal procedure to provide for feedback to the faculty member whose decision is being appealed and allowance for faculty rebuttal. The objectives of the committee will be to present one or more recommendations in the form of motion(s) for discussion and formal vote before the faculty senate. The recommendations will be to either reject changing the academic appeal procedure or provide specific language that changes the academic appeal procedure to provide for feedback to the faculty member and allow for faculty rebuttal of any claims. The Academic Affairs Committee shall report back to the faculty senate with recommendations at the next faculty senate meeting.

### **Discussion**

Doug Gelinas wished to make two points: 1) no one can change a grade except the professor involved and 2) students could appeal academic dismissal and faculty would not necessarily be kept informed every step of the way. Cohen stated that he is aware of at least when a grade was changed without the faculty member's knowledge. Alan stated that changing an E to a withdrawal seems to constitute a change of grade. The associate deans have looked at the policy recently.

**The motion was passed by a clear majority.**

### **Motion to Charge Academic Affairs Committee – Evaluation of Administrators (Owen Smith)**

#### **Preamble**

The evaluation of administrators by faculty is necessary to provide guidance for improved performance of administration and create responsiveness to faculty needs.

#### **Motion**

Move that the Academic Affairs Committee examine the necessity, existing mechanism, and protocols for evaluation of administrators by faculty. In particular the committee will report to the senate recommendations addressing the following:

protocols already in place for the evaluation of administrators by faculty; and  
modifications to existing procedures; or  
creation of new protocols for the evaluation of administrators by faculty.  
The committee will report their recommendations to the November senate meeting as one or more motions.

**It was almost immediately moved to question and the motion passed by a clear majority.**

### **Motion to Charge Constitution & By Laws Committee Procedures for Selecting Members of the Committee on Committees (Michael Grillo)**

#### **Preamble**

Article VII, Section 2, The Committee on Committees defines the membership to the Committee on Committees. The section does not prescribe a process for their selection. Currently we elect members from a list of all senate members, except those who just before the election ask from the floor to have their names removed. Last year, several senators complained that this system rankled them. Working in reverse from what one would normally expect — that one receives nominations or self-nominates.

#### **Motion**

Therefore, the motion is made that The Constitution and By Laws Committee address:

- 1) How the senate makes nominations to the Committee on Committees.
- 2) Whether to make a recommendation for changing the Constitution or By Laws.

The committee shall report back to the full senate with recommendation(s) by the December meeting.

**There was no discussion and the motion passed on a clear majority**

### **Motion to Charge the University Environment Committee Study Corporate Sponsorship and Advertising (Paul Bauschatz)**

#### **Preamble**

The University of Maine has impliedly or expressly endorsed corporations, corporate products, and services. This has resulted in advertisements and commercials on University property and at University events. The University has established no known published guidelines or reasonable limits to corporate advertising. The predictable result is that such advertising is becoming ever more intrusive and offensive to the academic environment. Some faculty and visitors to the University find this advertising offensive, intrusive, and inappropriate to an academic institution.

#### **Motion**

Therefore, the motion is made to charge the University Environment Committee to gather information, study, analyze, and make recommendation(s) to the senate on the following:

The need and extent of advertising and corporate sponsorship  
Guidelines or limits to advertisement  
The amount and use of the revenues generated by advertising

The committee shall report back to the full senate with recommendation(s) at the January meeting.

### **Discussion**

Kuhn-Hastings asked if the resolution falls within the jurisdiction of the faculty senate. Vollmers ruled the motion improper as not being with the jurisdiction. Grillo appealed this ruling, citing the provision relating to free speech. Alan Rosenwasser cited the bylaws that give a committee charge over the facilities. However, the bylaws are not the source of power, the constitution is. Knud Hermanson stressed that the jurisdiction of the faculty senate relates to the academic environment. Jim Horan stated that the senate is ultimately responsible for interpretation of its own rules. President Hoff was asked if the administration would welcome input on the issue and he stated he welcome input on any issue. The appeal passed by a vote of 22 to 15 and Vollmers ruling was overruled.

Kathleen March stated that the senate had nothing to lose by learning about the issues, but some members were concerned that the process would be a waste of time and energy. Ivan Manev moved to table the motion until it could be rewritten to reflect a more neutral stance. The motion died for lack of a second. Further discussion of the amount of time versus the benefit to be attained took place. It was moved to question.

**The motion passed.**

### **Resolution of the University of Maine Faculty Senate (Knud Hermanson)**

The University is composed of distinct units, each adding their efforts to a collective whole that produces a greater good. One unit, Onward, affects each and every academic unit, helping students from all majors that are the least prepared to nurture their inner potentials — and often does such an exemplary job that at graduation these students often exceed our most gifted students. Onward has a staff of so few, with a budget so small, yet helps so many. Such a unit deserves our highest respect and admiration.

Accordingly, we, members of the Faculty Senate, acting on behalf of University of Maine faculty, resolve to thank the staff and members of the Onward Program for their hard work and exemplary service to this University. Each and every department on this campus has benefited from students who, through the Onward program, have been encouraged and given the means to achieve goals and aspirations that were out-of-reach without Onward's aid. Through Onward's advice we, as faculty, have been enlightened, through their help, we, as mentors, have been blessed with better students, and through their example, we, as members of a community, are a better place to live and work.

Resolve that the faculty senate, representing the faculty of the University Of Maine, extend to the staff and members of the Onward program its most sincere appreciation and thanks for its hard work and commitment to the students, faculty, and University.

**The resolution passed unanimously**

### **Motion for Carrying Into Effect the Resolution (Knud Hermanson)**

Move that the Senate President present this resolution to Onward at a time, date, and place convenient to the President and Onward Staff and that the President attest to this resolution by affixing this date and her signature as President of the Senate for and on behalf of the faculty of the University of Maine.

**The motion passed.**

### **Motion to Expand the Charge of the Special Committee for Further Development of a Faculty Evaluation Form (Onsrud)**

#### **Preamble**

Recognition of superior teaching is encouraged and recognized at this campus. Faculty evaluation should not only help faculty improve their teaching, it should be a means to recognize faculty that achieve meritorious teaching. Consequently, where students have indicated meritorious teaching by both qualitative remarks and quantitative scores, those faculty should be recognized.

#### **Motion**

Therefore, the motion is made to expand the charge of the ad hoc committee known as "Special Committee on the Development and Implementation of a Faculty Evaluation Form" to include use of the form for recognition of meritorious teaching, if feasible. Therefore the special committee's charge shall be expanded to include such power as necessary to make recommendations to the full faculty regarding the proposed evaluation forms and use of evaluation forms in improving or recognizing meritorious faculty teaching.

### **Discussion**

Jim Horan wished to clarify that the action contemplated did not involve compensation as covered by the collective bargaining agreement. It does not.

**The motion passed by clear majority**

## **November 17, 1999 Motions**

### **Motion to Provide Funding to Remediate Certain Problems Associated with the Hudson Museum and the Bodwell Lounge – Bob Rice**

## Preamble

Since its opening in 1986 more than 164,000 people have visited the Hudson Museum. Of those, approximately 10,000 have participated in programs offered by and through the Museum and nearly 43,000 have visited during school field trips. Dozens of scholars have traveled to the museum to study collection pieces and to work with museum personnel. Furthermore, the faculties of several disciplines routinely use the Museum's collection for teaching purposes. The collection is considered one of the best of its type in the United States and is clearly an asset to the University.

Both chronic and acute problems plague the Museum space and extend to some of the collection. Also affected are the entrance corridors of the Maine Center for the Arts and the Bodwell Lounge/Dining area. The chronic problems result from mold and fungal growth near exterior walls and on the carpet. The carpet, which underlies both the collection spaces and the Bodwell Lounge, has also become infested with carpet beetles. Both the mold and the carpet beetles could destroy the collection or require it to be removed from public display. In view of the Museum's value as a teaching and research asset, the Finance and Institutional Planning Committee considers removing the collection from public display untenable.

Water vapor related problems rise and fall with both rainfall and humidity conditions. Of immediate concern is the gradual movement of water vapor through the improperly finished brick and masonry block walls. The condition has resulted in the development of mold and fungal growth in certain areas that house the collection and in the Bodwell Lounge, an area totaling approximately 14,000 square feet.

Remediation efforts for the museum collection have been aided by the recent purchase of a large freezer in which collection pieces can be frozen. The freezing acts to cleanse the objects of carpet beetles. However, measurements indicate that the infestation of carpet beetles and other insects injurious to the collection continues to grow exponentially in some areas of the Museum.

The Committee has consulted with Museum personnel, engineers, pest management specialists and administrators regarding possible remediation efforts for the Hudson. In view of limited funds, we believe that the most reasonable approach is the immediate expenditure of \$150,000 to replace the carpet in the collection spaces and in the Bodwell Lounge and to seal the bricks on the exterior of the building. Also mandatory is an ongoing treatment program by pest management specialists and the continued monitoring and treatment of sensitive collection objects.

**Motion:** The Administration of the University will dedicate a minimum of \$150,000 to remedy the acute problems of the Hudson Museum within 1.5 years from the date of adoption of this motion. In the first instance, the monies will be used to remediate the wall related moisture problems near the collection areas by sealing the bricks and masonry. Funds will also be dedicated to mitigate problems associated with the carpet in the collection areas and in the Bodwell Lounge by replacement with a more suitable material. It is also suggested that a long term strategy be developed in consultation with the affected parties and campus expertise to address the chronic building related problems with both the Maine Center for the Arts and the Hudson Museum.

**Discussion:** Bob Rice spoke about the investigation conducted by the committee. The museum could be closed; some parts of the exhibits have already been removed to storage. The mold in the Bodwell Lounge is permanent, it cannot be removed. The potential waste of valuable resources is unconscionable. Immediate action can keep the facility viable and available to students, faculty, and the community. Certainly there are other pressing needs on this campus that require funding. However, we must all recognize the value and importance of MCA.

Harlan Onsrud asked if the requested \$150,000 will be enough. Bob Rice replied that with constant monitoring, it would CONTROL the damage. Paula Petrik asked which office would provide the funding. President Hoff stated that the administration is not turning a blind eye to the problem. CFO Durringer stated that a bond issue to be conducted in the fall could be used as a source of funding. Owen Smith asked if the system does not have emergency funding that could be used. President Hoff replied that such a resource is available, and that active conversations are being conducted in that vein. Money can be found, but it must be recognized that means a reduction in funding somewhere else.

**The motion was put to a vote. 39 voted for and 1 opposed. A letter will be sent to President Hoff, and he will have one month in which to respond.**

[Hudson Museum]

## **Motion Regarding the Equitable Distribution of Fees Derived from the Sale of Pouring Rights to the Coca Cola Company – Bob Rice**

### Preamble

The University of Maine has entered into an alliance that allows exclusive rights for the sale of soft drinks on campus to the Coca Cola Company. The ten-year agreement returns approximately \$2,675,000 in cash to the University that will be metered through annual payments. An additional \$525,000 in non-cash royalties will also be provided by Coke during the life of the contract. The total contract value is approximately 3.2 million dollars of which \$600,000 will be paid as an initial payment.

In response to a request for input, the President has received organized petitions and collective responses in support of funding for the Fogler Library (Graduate Board, Provost's Office, Graduate Student Senate, Undergraduate Student Government) and for classroom refurbishment and technology enhancement (Academic Deans Council, Provost's Office). Responses from the President's electronic mail survey have been tallied and are categorized as parking (154), classrooms (124), scholarships (94), a recreation center (79), Fogler Library (57), instructional technology (45) and "other" (82). Support has also been voiced in support of Maine Bound, a fitness center, a recreation center and other uses.

The Finance and Institutional Planning committee believes that these funds should be used for the benefit of the students. The recommendation embodied in this motion is derived from a synthesis of student, administrative and faculty input and the Committee's collective assessment about where the many needs of the campus can be best served.

By reasoned argument, the Committee has been persuaded that use of “windfall” monies are not appropriate for stipend or scholarship increases. Rather, strategies should be developed that will increase the funding for these important areas using nonvolatile funds. The Committee also believes that issues related to campus parking cannot be solved using these funds and that the parochial interests of Colleges, faculty, administrators and non-representative student groups should be funded from other sources.

Since these funds are offered based on the soft drink purchasing habits of students, the monies should be allocated, primarily, for their benefit. We believe that this allocation should, in the first instance, enhance the academic environment of the University and be followed by the consideration of social needs and issues.

#### **Motion:**

The funds received from the beverage alliance with the Coca Cola company should be spent to enhance the student experience, first academically and then socially at the University of Maine. To this end, 80 percent of the incoming cash disbursement should be spent for collection development in the Fogler Library and for classroom refurbishment and technology enhancement. The allocation for each initiative should be half of the 80 percent. The remaining 20 percent of the incoming funds should be placed in escrow and apportioned among projects as student needs arise.

Further, the use of funds for both library and classrooms should be evident and demonstrable in the short term, here defined as two years from the date of adoption of this motion. Existing and future allocations for the Fogler Library and for planned classroom refurbishment should not now, nor in the future, be diminished by the allotment of this funding.

#### **Discussion:**

Parking and scholarships were ruled out as uses for the money. These two issues cannot be addressed with one-time windfall monies. Eilers asked if additional library funding was not the way, meaning that more money could be allocated to classrooms. Rice replied that the new funding was considered by the committee, and that even with that, the library is in serious need of funding. Jagels suggested that it is easier to secure funding for the library than for classrooms, and that, therefore, these monies would be better applied to classrooms. Rice replied that the library's needs have been pushed aside for 10 years. Other sources of funding for classrooms are also being pursued.

Nicolson asked how the library would use the money. Rice replied for collection growth. The issue of the need for new journals as opposed to new books was discussed by many.

Justin Kelleher stated that the student government felt that the money should be used for students (since it proceeds from the results of sales to students), and that use for social activities for students was more reflective of the spirit of the agreement. However, the student government, recognizing the critical state of the library, had recommend use of the money for that institution.

Jagels suggested that the impact of purchasing more books might be relatively small, and that a more creative use could be found for the money, such as covering the cost of Interlibrary Loan.

Owen Smith stated that perhaps the coke money could be used for the MCA. This was not offered as a motion or an amendment to any action item, and was not voted on by the faculty.

#### **The motion passed by clear majority.**

[Coco-Cola Rights]

#### **Motion on the Nature and Procedures of the Academic Appeal of Work and Grades**

**Preamble:** Upon review of the existing procedures for the academic appeal by a student of the evaluation of work and grades the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate Finds that the Motion on the Nature and Procedures of the Academic Appeal of Work and Grades procedures are fair and reasonable. They are clearly laid out so as to allow for appropriate appeals by the student of a dispute over a grade or evaluation and are further worded so as to protect and balance both the rights of the student and the ultimate responsibility of the faculty member in the determination of the final grade. The Specific procedures are as follows:

##### **Evaluation of Work and Grades**

1. If a dispute arises over a grade or evaluation of a paper or work, the student should discuss the concern with the appropriate faculty member.
2. If the concern persists, the student may consult with the chairperson of the department (or the dean of the college if there are no departments) who attempts to resolve the complaint.
3. Failing this, the student may request the use of a departmental ad hoc committee composed of three members: (1) faculty member chosen by student; (2) faculty member chosen by the involved faculty member; (3) faculty member chosen by the department chairperson with the agreement of student and involved faculty member. Both the student and faculty member will prepare a written brief and appear before the committee. Any witnesses desired by either person may be called. The student and/or the faculty member may be represented by a person of their own choosing, such person being acceptable to the committee.
4. If the student is not satisfied with the committee decision, he or she may write to the dean of the college where the course is offered requesting a review of the situation.

5. Following this, and if there is lingering dissatisfaction on the part of the student, the student may make a final appeal in writing to the vice president for academic affairs. However, the faculty member has the ultimate responsibility for determination of grades.

The foregoing steps must be made in order of progression and all information, recommendations, and decisions made available to the next level of appeal. Maximum efforts and attempts should be exerted toward resolution of concerns without the necessity of appeal.

Given the reasonableness of these procedures and that they clearly state "... the faculty member has the ultimate responsibility for determination of grades," we the members of the Academic Affairs Committee feel that there is no need to alter the stated policy.

**Motion:** The Academic Affairs Committee moves that the current policy for academic appeal of work and grades be reaffirmed as it states that "the faculty member has the ultimate responsibility for determination of grades" and thus no grade may be changed except by the specific faculty member in question.

**Discussion:**

Owen Smith stated that the main reason for the motion relates to a concern that faculty be kept apprised during any appeals process. This motion reaffirms that faculty have the final authority with any grade, so no grade can be changed without first informing the faculty member involved.

**The motion was seconded by Knud Hermansen and passed by a clear majority.**

[Work and Grades]

### **Motion to charge the Academic Affairs Committee to review the 30 credit hour residency requirement – Michael Grillo**

**Preamble:** The current residency requirement at the University of Maine is 30 credit hours in the senior year. There are two exceptions to this (approved by the Trustees in 1978) but they refer to people who have already taken three years of courses at the University of Maine (see Student Handbook, pg 58 or Undergraduate Bulletin, pg 497). One request for an exception has been received by the vice provost and rejected. This was a request to take some of the final 30 hours via distance education courses originating from other UMS institutions. In view of the increased interest in distance education, and the likelihood that more requests of this nature will occur, it may be time to review this policy.

**Motion:** The Academic Affairs Committee will review the 30 credit hour residency requirement and either reaffirm the current policy or recommend modifications.

[30 Credit Hour Residency]

#### **Discussion**

Horan stated that more distance education and thus more requests to waive the residency requirement is clearly a trend.

**The motion passed by a clear majority.**

### **December 15, 1999 Motions**

#### **Motion to Monitor and Encourage Faculty Senator Attendance**

##### **Motion presented by Michael Grillo**

The Faculty Senate can only represent its diverse constituencies in all of the colleges if their elected members attend, or appoint substitutes to attend the meetings so that we may act in a responsive, timely, and comprehensive manner in the interests of the University of Maine.

#### **Motion:**

To insure adequate college representation on the Senate and its committees, provide for equitable Senate work loads, and also prevent abusive reporting (e.g., absentee faculty claiming Senate service on promotion requests), the Constitution and By-Laws Committee recommends that the Senate limit each senator to three unexcused absences per year from the Elected Members and the Full Senate meetings. Should a senator miss more than that without sending a substitute, the President of the Senate will ask the College represented by the member to hold new elections to replace that senator.

The motion was seconded by Jim Horan.

#### **Discussion:**

Kass asked what would happen if the member appointed a substitute, but the substitute failed to attend. We should give the senator a chance to address that circumstance before action is taken. Grillo replied that communication should always be open. Patterson moved that a friendly amendment be added: "Should a senator miss more than that without sending a substitute, the President of the Senate will send a letter to the member. Should the member fail to respond credibly, the President will send a letter to the Dean of the College represented by the member."

Kass seconded the friendly amendment.

March asked about the case of members on sabbatical. This situation is already covered by the constitution. The member must get a long-term substitute. James Wilson stated that many faculty have obligations off-campus. Under these circumstances they will not run for Faculty Senate. This creates a bias in the membership. Horan replied that whenever a member can't come, they must arrange for a substitute. Grillo stressed the frustration experienced by members when discussions must be repeated. Hermansen stated that we would never accept such absenteeism from our students. We cannot represent our colleges if we are not here. Nicholson believes that the elected members meeting is different, and should not be included in the motion with the full meeting. Grillo replied that the Senate needs to take itself seriously. The elected members meetings are

productive and important. March stated that she believes the motion is a good idea. When people are not at the elected members meetings, it is difficult to get things done. The motion would make the Senate stronger.

Dana Humphrey stated that a specific procedure is needed. Onsrud asked for specifics about what is considered an excused absense. Grillo replied that some wiggle room is needed. Owen Smith again compared the matter to student absenses. Just like our students, senators should show commitment, and need to make choices in their obligations. Mary Ellen Symanski noted that the President already has the power to remove members from the Senate. Kass stated that the motion is too vague, it needs to be defined.

Horan stated that the Senate has survived so far with the existing By-Laws.

**Jagels moved to table the motion. 26 members voted for this motion and 16 against. The motion is tabled.**

**Motion to Change the Procedure for Selecting Members of the Committee on Committees:**

**Motion presented by Michael Grillo**

While Article VII, Section 2, of the Constitution defines the membership of the Committee on Committees, it does not prescribe a process for their selection. Currently, we elect members from a list of all Senate members, except those who, just before the election, ask from the floor to have their names removed. Last year, several senators complained that this system rankled them, in working in reverse from what one would normally expect, naturally, that one receives nominations or self-nominates.

**Motion:**

The Constitution and By-Laws Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate select members to the Committee on Committees as follows: By the end of the Spring semester, the Faculty Senate shall hold elections for the Committee on Committees, by calling for nominations or self-nominations from the floor. Once each college has at least one candidate listed, the President will ask the whole Senate to vote on Committee's membership, college by college, to ensure the prescribed representation.

**Discussion:**

Jagels asked what the Committee does. Jane Smith replied that it finds faculty to serve on administrative committees and controls the election of the President of the Faculty Senate.

**The motion passed by a clear majority.**

**The person who was to have done the Update on concerns about the Academic Computing Advisory Committee was not in attendance.**

**Michael Grillo moved to add the report on Maine Hour to the Agenda. Bob Rice seconded.**

**Report on Maine Hour – Ed Ferguson**

**Background:**

The committee met on 6 December with Scott Anchors and student intern Molly Putnam (Judy Kuhns-Hastings absent). Our charge is to prepare a recommendation to the Faculty Senate regarding the continuance of the Maine Hour. Following is an attempt to both summarize the meeting and form a report for the Senate.

The Maine Hour as an institution was recommended by the Blue Ribbon Panel to give a convenient time which most faculty and students would have unencumbered by classes for conferences, meetings, speakers, etc. It was implemented this Fall on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 2:10 to 3:00 PM. To evaluate its success, Scott Anchors put together two surveys, one for faculty and the other for students.

150 surveys were sent to department chairs and Senate members. Responses were received from 56 of them. Of these roughly a third reported using the Maine Hour for department meetings; approximately the same number reported the Maine Hour limited the number of sections or classes their departments offered. There was no increase in student contact reported by

86% of the responders; 61% would not endorse continuing the experiment (23% would).

76 surveys (paper) were sent to the putative leaders of student organizations. One was returned. There may have been problems in the mailing: the listed leader may no longer be in charge, the address on record may be out of date, etc. The survey was posted in a folder on First Class. Several hundred students looked at it; 24 filled out a response. Exactly half reported attending something which took place during the Maine Hour. 9 said their club or organization had used the time. 8 reported an increase in attendance at meetings while 2 reported a problem in their scheduling. 20 would support continuing the Maine Hour.

Our view of these results is that there is a large amount of indifference toward the Maine Hour. This is possibly due to many people not knowing of its existence.

An attempt was made to minimize the number of students and faculty in classes at this hour. The effect of this was less than might have been hoped. Comparing class activity at the 2:10 hour in Fall, 1998, and Fall, 1999, we have:

	1998		1999	
	Section	Students	Section	Students
Monday	69	1117	42	675

Wednesday	76	1231	59	859
Friday	59	916	37	494

The reduction is significant, but there are still many students and faculty who are unable to take advantage of the Maine Hour.

Given all the above, the committee does not find the Maine Hour to have been of great value. However, the Blue Ribbon Panel put much thought into this and had certain expectations for it. We are unwilling to discard the idea on the basis of what may have been a poorly organized test. We submit the following

#### **MOVED:**

It is the recommendation of the Faculty Senate that if the goals of the Blue Ribbon Panel still seem viable to the President, that the Maine Hour be reinstituted in Fall, 2000. If this is done, the time should be given a specific focus, for example:

the time is for faculty – student meetings the time is for seminars, colloquia, visiting speakers, etc.

the time is for meetings of campus organizations

The time of the Maine Hour should be chosen with its purpose in mind and a concerted effort made to eliminate classes at that hour. A specific exception procedure should be instituted and a record of exceptions kept.

The time and philosophy of the hour should be widely publicized. The groups which are specifically targeted as the focus should also be targeted for specific publicity on its existence and encouraged to use it.

An evaluation procedure should be decided on before Fall, 2000.

The motion was seconded by Eilers.

#### **Discussion:**

Hermansen stated that apparently most people don't care about Maine Hour. Why give a bad idea another year when valuable class time is needed? Cook said that in his department, club attendance is up. Use of Maine Hour must vary by unit, and it was aggressively advertised in his unit.

Farthing moved that the motion be amended to call for discontinuance of Maine Hour. Hermansen seconded.

Nicholson noted that since many classes were still held during Maine Hour, the time was not really available. Hoff stated, that although the burden of proof is on the proponents of the initiative, Maine Hour has only been in place for 10 weeks and was evaluated when it had only been in place for 5-6 weeks. Petteway stated that the idea has really not been generally supported. Classes are still being held. Also, the survey did not always reach the intended respondents, since he did not get one. Kass stated that Maine Hour needs to be made more public—the idea has never really been tried or treated seriously.

Eilers stated that students do perceive a need for a greater sense of community, and that the idea does have potential for building community. It needs to be tried for at least 2, maybe as many as 4 years. Grillo does not agree that this is the way to build community. The important intangibles (the Maine Hours effect on programs) cannot be measured. The Maine Hour is too destructive to the academic day. Bob Rice noted that we currently have no time to come together across campus.

Jagels stated that the initiative treats units with a substantial number of lab courses as second class citizens. It divides the University. Perhaps one hour a week would be more reasonable. Jim McConnon asked if other institutions had instituted a similar idea. Donijo Robbins replied that at Rutgers there was a 1 ½ hour time period every day and that it was an effective measure there. She also noted that, to date, there has been no real reduction in the amount of classes held during Maine Hour.

Owen Smith said that he had initially opposed the idea, but had served on a committee over the summer and had come to understand its worth. Perhaps the Maine Hour could be constituted differently, such as being held for 2-3 hours once a week. March stressed the need to consider other scheduling issues, such as childcare, work hour, etc., that would be impacted by Maine Hour.

Hoff noted that the numbers show that no real change took place, but only a very minor shift. He recommended working with the idea more. Petteway said that the students are in favor of the idea—those who know about it, use it.

**The vote on the substitute motion was 10 in favor. It failed.**

**The vote on the original motion was 32 in favor, 12 opposed. It passes.**

**Resolution in Favor of Increasing Graduate Student Stipends—Teresa Groves**

#### **Preamble**

Graduate Students make significant contributions to the teaching and research mission of the University of Maine. They offer critical instruction in many of the core undergraduate courses, facilitate hands-on experiences in laboratory settings, and provide the drive that fuels many of the more innovative research projects on this campus. A high quality graduate student can enrich the undergraduate experience as well as increase the productivity of faculty members in their research endeavors.

Providing an attractive stipend is one of the best ways of attracting the best graduate students to this campus. Yet the University of Maine continues to lag behind in meeting this challenge, both with its primary competitors as well as on a national scale. For example, the minimum UMaine teaching assistant stipend of \$7,236 falls well below that of other northeastern land grant institutions (UNH: \$10,400, UVM: \$10,225, University of Rhode Island: \$9,555, UConn: \$14,155). Other institutions across the country often offer other benefits as well, such as health insurance, twelve-month appointments and pay raises based on time of service.

The recent support from the state legislature for R&D and the university as a whole offers an unprecedented opportunity for progress on this issue. The Association of Graduate Students and the Graduate Board have made the raising of stipend levels a priority for the coming year in order to maintain the excellence of our graduate programs.

### **Motion**

The Faculty Senate supports the raising of graduate student stipends on campus and encourages the provost to work with college deans and other University of Maine administrators to develop plans to address this issue within the context of the individual colleges. Furthermore, the Faculty Senate would request that the president and his administration make these plans a priority item for discussion during the upcoming budget development process.

Roger King seconded the motion

### **Discussion:**

Onsrud proposed the motion be amended to read "and/or health insurance." Groves noted that would not help all graduate students since some already have health insurance. Eilers noted that the Deans have asked that this issue be given priority. Cook stated that we need to maintain the current number of graduate assistants, not have fewer, more highly paid students. Richard Brucher stated that clerical and professional employees are also being paid less than national norms.

Owen Smith asked why the language read "with the context of the individual colleges"? Sean replied that each college apparently has different idea about how to implement the raise, and flexibility was desired. Jim McConnon asked if the minimum would be raised, or all stipends. Groves replied that the minimum would be raised. Jim McClymer stated that graduate students raises are supposed to be tied to faculty raises. Sean stated that has not happened.

**The motion passed by a clear majority.**

### **March 29, 2000 Motions**

### **April 19, 2000 Motions**

### **May 17, 2000 Motions**

- [Home](#)
- [About Us](#)
- [Constitution](#)
- [Bylaws](#)
- [Faculty Handbook](#)
- [Meeting Dates](#)
- [Senate Structure](#)
- [Senate Membership Roster 2020/2021](#)
- [Faculty Senate Members By College](#)
- [Senate Committees](#)
- [Motions Passed](#)
- [Senate Minutes](#)
- [Documents](#)
- [Senate History](#)